Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BV825 .A221
Adamson, R. M MAIN
Christian doctrine of the Lord's Supper
3 9967 00206 6830

VIRGINIA LIBRARY

PRESBYTERIAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHICAGO

826 Belden Avenue

$1.50

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

THE
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE
OF THE
LORD'S SUPPER

BY THE

REV. ROBERT M. ADAMSON, M.A.

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1905

Printed by

MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH

LONDON : SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED

NEW YORK : CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

2751

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMIN

8
A2

TO

MY FATHER

IN MEMORY

OF EARLY INSTRUCTION

28138

PREFACE

THE subject of the Lord's Supper is one of intrinsic and perennial interest to the Christian mind. Of the Sacraments which were ordained by the Divine Founder of the Church it is by far the more prominent. The solemn, affecting, and memorable hour in which it was appointed, the wealth of religious truth it embodies, its efficacy as a means of communion with the Lord and of fellowship between believers, its unintermittent celebration throughout the Christian era and the Church catholic, the frequency of its observance in the Christian life, as well as the piety, erudition, and controversy by which it is enriched,—these are but a few of the circumstances which render it unique. To think truly and fruitfully upon so important a Rite is ever incumbent upon both learned and simple.

The state of theological thought at the present moment is not unfavourable to the study of

Eucharistic doctrine. For there are many signs of re-awakened interest in those higher reaches of doctrinal truth which figure so largely in the New Testament, the historic creeds, and in Christian experience generally.

During the last half century a number of factors determining the direction of Christian thought have been somewhat adverse to dogmatic interests. Activity with respect to the principle of evolution has called for a recasting of apologetics, and for a new defence of spiritual as against materialistic views of the universe. Industry in biblical criticism has raised many questions as to the authenticity and reliability of the records. Evangelism has been apt to content itself with simple and fervent assertions as to sin and its atonement through the Saviour's Cross. Philanthropic sympathies and Christian socialism have drawn their inspiration rather from the character and work of Jesus as the Son of Man than as the eternal Son of God.

At present, however, it is felt that evolution theories need not disconcert, but may rather prove illuminative in the religious domain. Documentary criticism, so far from shaking the Christian foundations, now affords fresh proof of their validity. Evangelism seems to remain too elementary if a few only of the notes in the gamut of Christian doctrine

be sounded. And the service of man needs richer and more potent sanctions than can be supplied by mere ethics.

The question, therefore, as to how we can best enter again into the vast treasury of transcendental truth contained in the Holy Scriptures and expounded by the classic divines, is one of growing interest; and the restatement of positive dogma in real terms compatible with newer intellectual conceptions is a task for the immediate future. Some progress in this direction is being made; and, if we may judge from the history of Christian theology in the past, the Lord's Supper will not be found wanting both as a store-house of truths to be reclothed in living language, and as a medium through which the power of these truths may be experienced afresh.

The present contribution to dogmatic study of the Sacrament will supply (it is humbly hoped) a volume which the author believes to be greatly needed—namely, a brief conspectus of the main course of thought upon the subject from the earliest beginnings down to the most recent developments of the doctrine. An endeavour has been made to include some reference to every view of typical importance.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	vii
I.	OLD TESTAMENT BEGINNINGS	1
II.	THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	8
III.	THE EARLY FATHERS	27
IV.	RISE AND GROWTH OF THE SACRIFICIAL IDEA	37
V.	THE GREEK CHURCH	42
VI.	REFORMATION OF THE DOCTRINE	55
VII.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINE IN ENGLAND	66
VIII.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINE IN SCOTLAND	79
IX.	COURSE OF THOUGHT FROM 1643 TO 1800	93
X.	THE NINETEENTH CENTURY	109
XI.	CONSTRUCTIVE RESTATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE	132
XII.	THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE LITURGIES	193
XIII.	THE LORD'S SUPPER IN DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE	227
XIV.	PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE	257
	INDEX	285

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

CHAPTER I

OLD TESTAMENT BEGINNINGS

IT is happily no longer necessary to contend that the Divine character of a revelation or of a rite is not at all impugned by the application of the principle of development. The great ideas embodied in the One Sacrifice and implied in the Lord's Supper may be found in germ in the earliest conceptions of sacrifice.

Sacrifice has been defined as "an act, belonging to the sphere of worship, in which a material oblation is presented to the Deity and consumed in His service, and which has as its object to secure through communion with a Divine being the boon

of his favour."[1] "Sacrifice is primarily a sacramental meal, at which the communicants are a deity and his worshippers, and the elements the flesh and blood of a sacred victim."[2] Crude as may be the early conceptions of sacrifice, they yet contain seeds of highest truth, which we behold blossoming into full splendour in the Cross of Jesus Christ and in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. Leaving behind the origins of sacrifice faintly descried in the dark backward and abysm of time, and passing over the more clearly defined ideas and practices belonging to Semitic cults in general, we may see in the religion of the Old Testament not a few types, emblems, and anticipations of the Christian Sacrament.

It would, of course, be unscientific to look amongst those adumbrations for any such distinct previsions as the older theologians, and even some recent Anglican writers, have loved to discover. The running citation of passages which we are about to give is rather made from the spiritualising viewpoint, which (as it is independent of Biblical criticism) is still quite legitimate in its own place.

To begin with the patriarchal narratives, the

[1] Paterson in art. on "Sacrifice" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

[2] Strachan in art. on "Sacrifice" in Chambers's *Encyclopædia*.

offerings of Abel [1] and of Noah [2] are not without suggestiveness in respect of the One Offering of Christ, and of the sacred Rite which commemorates the New Covenant. The Covenant made with Noah has its sacramental token. "I do set My bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between Me and the earth." [3] The Covenant sacrifices of Abraham [4] abound in correlative ideas. The gifts made by Melchizedek,[5] priest of the Most High God, on the occasion of his blessing Abraham when he brought forth bread and wine, are referred to by early Christian Fathers as pointing forward to the Communion of bread and wine. Similar use has been made of the oblation of the shewbread upon the Tabernacle Table [6] with its cloth of blue; a use readily suggested by such descriptive names as "hallowed bread," "holy bread" (R.V.), "continual bread," "loaves of the setting forth," "presence bread." This ritual expression of the truth that God is the source of man's bread, together with the accompanying thought of sacrificial thanksgiving, is frankly Eucharistical. Here, too, we may call to mind the golden pot which Aaron [7] was told to place in the

[1] Gen. iv. [2] Gen. viii. [3] Gen. ix. 13.
[4] Gen. xviii. etc. [5] Gen. xiv. 18. [6] Ex xxv. 30.
[7] Ex. xvi. 33.

ark of the testimony as a perpetual memorial of the provision of Manna, that "bread of the mighty," or "angels' food." The Manna itself is a favourite type of the spiritual bread which is found in Him who is the Bread of God, the Bread from heaven, the Bread given for the life of the world. In the Old Testament itself it becomes a type of man's spiritual nutriment. "And He fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that He might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live."[1] From the Psalmist's promise that "there shall be an handful of corn on the top of the mountains,"[2] the Rabbis inferred that the gift of Manna would be renewed by the Messiah; a hope spiritually fulfilled in Christianity. Isaiah's Coal of Fire[3] reappears frequently in patristic homilies and primitive liturgies as a type of "that true Coal which giveth life to our souls, bodies, and spirits, that is, the Holy Body and Precious Blood of Thy Christ."[4] In the same way St. Ephrem interprets the Coals of Fire in Ezekiel's[5] vision as "the living Coals of the life-giving Body of our Lord."[6] But, of course, it is the Passover which is

[1] Deut. viii. 3. [2] Ps. lxxii. 16. [3] Isa. vi. 6.
[4] Lit. of St. Cyr. [5] Ezek. x. [6] On Ezek. x. 2.

at once richest in sacramental truths and most germane to the Lord's Supper. The ancient Feast itself was replete with religious ideas not entirely understood even by such Biblical scholars as have studied it most deeply.

It seems certain that the Passover took its rise from something deeper and more universal than the deliverance from Egypt, with which it came to have so immediate a historical association. There appears to be truth in Wellhausen's view that, generally viewed, the Passover was originally the sacrifice of the firstborn. From the simple and fundamental thought, as important for the piety of to-day as for that of ages ago, that all good things come from God, and that thankful recognition of this fact should be made before the great Giver, there sprang the custom of grateful rejoicing by means of a sacrificial feast. It was such a primeval feast that the Israelites requested Pharaoh to grant them the opportunity of keeping in the wilderness. The time is the spring, the season at which the Exodus took place. Or was it not so much the instinct of thankful rejoicing as the equally spontaneous sense of the need of atonement that lay at the root of the Passover? Full of far-reaching interest is the theory developed by the author of the *Threshold Covenant*,[1]

[1] H. C. Trumbull.

that the Passover arises from an ancient custom, traces and forms of which are still widely spread among the races of mankind, according to which a guest is welcomed "by the outpouring of blood on the threshold of the door, and by staining the doorway itself with the blood of the covenant." It is sufficient for us to remark that all the religious ideas attaching to these theories have their ennobled counterpart in the New Passover.

Nor should it be forgotten that in all other feasts, such as that of Tabernacles, Pentecost, Purim, Dedication, we may find permanent religious significance capable of being incorporated with the Christian Feast. The festal gatherings, also, which the Prophets forecast as celebrating the joys of the Messianic Reign, with its abundance of corn and wine, are sublimated in our Heavenly Banquet.

"And in this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined."[1]

And this conception reappears in a form more suggestive of the feast of reason and flow of soul in the invitation issued by Wisdom—"Come, eat ye of my bread, and drink of my wine which I have mingled."[2] A fine imaginative use has also been

[1] Isa. xxv. 6. [2] Prov. ix. 5.

made of the Song of Songs in application to the Lord's Supper—"I sat down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit was sweet to my taste. He brought me to the banqueting house, and his banner over me was love."[1]

It is especially writers disposed to emphasise the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist who see in it the fulfilment of Malachi's prophecy, "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same My name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering."[2]

[1] Cant. ii. 4. [2] Mal. i. 11.

CHAPTER II

THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE allusions to the Lord's Supper which we find scattered throughout the New Testament are more numerous than is usually supposed. Before we come to the Institution itself, let us note in the Gospels the appearance of certain ideas fitted to prepare the mind for the creation of a Rite which was to subsume so many of the essential truths of Christianity.

The ruling fact of the Incarnation affords a basis for the material nature of the Sacrament. The Son of God assumed material form, and the reality of His human Body and Blood was to be for ever kept in mind by virtue of the physical elements of the Holy Mystery. And as the Incarnate One was the Eternal Word, so the Sacrament is truly described as the "Verbum Visibile"; not only because of the unspoken truth symbolised in sensuous form and act, but also because "word and sacrament" are

indissolubly united. The *words* that Christ speaks, they are spirit and they are life; and only thus can the Word made flesh dwell again among us, full of grace and truth. This keynote of incarnation is swiftly followed by that of sacrifice. "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."[1] So soon did the forerunner herald that obedience unto death, even the death of the Cross, which was to be showed forth in the breaking of bread and the outpouring of wine. So early does the Saviour appear in the character of the Paschal Lamb.

Meanwhile, however, the note of sacrificial suffering is momentary. The human life is to be lived. That it was no ascetic life, that the Son of Man came eating and drinking, that He appeared as a wedding-guest, that He turned water into wine, that He ate and drank with publicans and sinners, that He sat with rich Pharisees at their tables, that He accepted a feast as an expression of friendship's love, that He Himself gave to a large company such a meal that "they did all eat and were filled," all His hearers being graciously made His guests and treated at a "splendid entertainment"; that He commended condescension and bountifulness "when thou makest

[1] John i. 29.

a dinner or a supper,"—does not all this appropriately lead up to a meal which well might sanctify all common meals, to a feast which well might hallow all other festal occasions, to a marriage-supper fitted to consecrate all bridal unions, and to a fellowship whose effect is to beautify all human intercourse?

Parable preceded and paved the way for sacrament in significant fashion. On the occasion of his great supper, the host sends forth his messengers into the highways and byways that his house may be filled. At the royal marriage-feast a wedding garment, gratuitously bestowed, is provided for each guest. In another instance, when the bridegroom is announced, the virgins must hasten (at their peril) to trim their lamps against his approach. How many "action sermons" have been preached upon these illuminative parables!

But it is the grand acted parable of the feeding of the multitude as interpreted by the Master Himself that points forward most explicitly. The picture is dominated by the central figure of Jesus as the considerate, compassionate Sustainer of man's life, and Reliever of their hunger and weariness. The Johannine report of the Lord's discourse is full of that profound mysticism which belongs to the very idea of a sacrament. That the writer of the 6th

chapter of St. John had the Lord's Supper in mind seems all but certain. Does he also imply that the Divine Speaker had the same thought? Dr. Sanday has doubts about the *direct* Eucharistical value of the discourse, while other scholars like Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Denney think it incredible that the future Rite could have been absent from His mind. Supporters of a high view of the Sacrament naturally claim the fullest explicit reference here, and are perhaps too ready to assume it. Certainly there is much to be said for the view that, while the discourse has a significance far wider than a merely sacramental one, and might well stand intact even though no sacrament existed, yet both the Teacher and the disciple intended a conscious bearing upon the Supper. It was our Lord's custom to prepare the minds of His disciples for later emergencies by leading them in the direction contemplated. There are abundant evidences that the whole scheme of His mission was (so to say) extensively thought out by Him at an early stage. In His discourse to Nicodemus, where entrance into the kingdom is connected with water, we have a preliminary hint regarding the initial Sacrament of Baptism. And it is still more obvious that if our Lord desired an occasion on which to introduce some teaching preparatory to the Institution, He could have found

no more graphic opportunity than that offered by the miraculous feeding. The words about eating His flesh and drinking His blood, unintelligible to the Jews and even to the disciples, are now most simply and naturally understood in the light of the Sacrament of His body and blood. Such an interpretation were too external and unspiritual, did it leave out of account the inward appropriation of the benefits of Christ's death, or the practical acceptance of the doctrine of the Cross; but the Sacramental interpretation, so far from excluding, rather accentuates all that. The most literal and therefore probably the first meaning which an ordinary Christian, familiar with the ordinances of our religion, would attach to these words of Jesus would be that of communicating in the Sacrament; for in no other way do we so directly, evidently, and intelligibly eat His flesh and drink His blood.

Is there any cogency in the contention of Vicesimus Knox[1] that "our Lord Himself appointed a prayer which, though it might be properly used on other occasions, was *particularly* intended by Him for the celebration of the Lord's Supper"? Unfortunately, there is uncertainty as to the precise meaning of ἐπιούσιος. Interest, however, attaches to

[1] *Nature and Efficacy of the Lord's Supper.*

Jerome's translation, in which he changed *quotidianum* into *supersubstantialem:* his reason being his belief in the synonymity (at least to some extent) of ἐξαίρετος, περιούσιος, and ἐπιούσιος. These words Jerome considers to contain the same meaning, namely, "select, singularly excellent." "Therefore whenever we pray God to give us this singular and excellent bread, which we do when we pray for *artos epiousios*, we pray for that Bread which He declares Himself to be when He says in St. John, 'I am the living Bread which came down from heaven.'" Ambrose gives "supersubstantial." Damascenus says that the body of Christ which is received in the Sacrament enters into the very nature and essence of our souls (εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν). It is therefore called ἐπιούσιος. Cyril, Cyprian, Tertullian, Augustine are enlisted on the same side.

But we must turn to the actual Institution of the Supper. "One almost despairs," writes Dr. Denney,[1] "of saying anything about the Lord's Supper which will not seem invalid to some upon critical or more general grounds." Let us take the accounts as they stand, beginning with the earliest, namely, that of St. Paul.

We may dismiss the suggestion that the Lord's Supper did not become a sacrament until it was made one at the hands of St. Paul, and rather agree with

[1] *The Death of Christ*, p. 46.

Gilbert,[1] that although, so far as our records go, St. Paul was the first to unfold the deeper meaning of the Supper, it does not follow that the ideas he develops originated with himself, or were absent from the minds of those who engaged in the Rite at the earliest stage. However few the recorded words of Jesus Himself about the Supper, they are instinct with the truths expressed by St. Paul. And in the great passage in 1 Cor. xi., the Apostle solemnly refers to the Lord as his original authority, by which "we must understand St. Paul to say that what he had handed on to the Corinthians had before been handed on to him, and went back originally to the Lord Himself. The Lord was the point from which he started. . . . His originality is sometimes exaggerated. He did not invent Christianity; there were Apostles and preachers and men in Christ before him. And the doctrinal tradition of Christianity, if we may call it so, was supplemented and guaranteed by the ritual one."

The textual questions connected with the accounts of the Institution have of late years been treated with thoroughness by a great variety of New Testament scholars. Without entering into such minutiæ, although bearing them in mind, let us take a brief survey of significant data supplied by the accounts.

[1] *The First Interpreters of Jesus*, p. 180.

In the *locus classicus* of 1 Corinthians, St. Paul begins by calling the Rite "the Lord's Supper." There seems little ground for Dr. A. Robertson's view that the "Lord's Supper" means strictly not the Eucharist celebrated at any ordinary time, but only that celebrated at the anniversary of the Last Supper.

The Rite appears in close connection with the Agapé. And here we may set aside Dr. Beet's view, that there was little distinction between the social and the Eucharistical parts of the whole proceedings. In correcting the Corinthian abuses, the Apostle gives weight to his rebuke by recounting in the most solemn manner the Lord's authoritative Institution. The best opinion interprets St. Paul's "received of the Lord" as meaning a direct revelation from the glorified Christ. It is not the first time that St. Paul has made such a solemn deliverance to the Corinthians. It was on the night of betrayal that the Rite originated. The absence of reference to the old Passover sheds no light upon the question as to whether the Paschal Meal was eaten on that night; but St. Paul's mention here of the New Covenant, as well as his expression elsewhere, "Christ our Passover," connects the new Rite with the old. The essential acts of the Lord are common to all the accounts. The separation of the cup from

the bread is in Dr. Plummer's[1] view made greater by St. Paul's "after supper"; but this point is of little importance. The double command to "do this in remembrance" is peculiar to St. Paul; but this peculiarity (even if St. Luke's "remembrance" be interpolated) is not in contradiction to the Evangelists. St. Paul is not alone in giving the Supper an eschatological significance, although his way of putting this suggests the Second Coming of Christ more pointedly. The rest (from ver. 27) is purely Pauline. The guiltiness of unworthy communicating is clear. It ought never to have been anything else but clear, that unworthiness does not refer to that personal unworthiness which attaches more or less to all Christians; and that the judgment incurred does not necessarily imply damnation in the sense of perdition. For in the sequence St. Paul exhorts those unworthy communicants to return to the Table in a worthier fashion. A man, however (that is, every man), ought to examine himself, so that he may avoid unworthy communicating. It may be added that St. Paul's dependence upon the word of the glorified Jesus contributes nothing to Dr. Briggs' view that the Institution dates from after the Lord's Resurrection.

The Synoptists add little to the account of St.

[1] Art. in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Paul. Certain variations as to the Lord's words will be indicated in our liturgical chapter. It is St. Luke that calls for most remark. He refers to two cups, the first of the two being probably the third of the old Passover. Christ's reference to the Passover of the future Kingdom, St. Luke connects with the earlier of the two cups. But there is no need to suppose that he erred in this; for Christ may very naturally have made a repeated reference to the future. The grounds for contending that St. Luke's word about "remembrance" is interpolated, are by no means conclusive; but even if this were an interpolation, the value of St. Paul's words is no whit impaired. Additional words of St. Luke, frequently neglected, are those of xxii. 29, 30: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me; that ye may eat and drink at My table in My kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." St. Luke thus accentuates the significance of the Supper in its reference to the future Kingdom; and the fact that in all the accounts this reference has so prominent a place justifies the claim for its fuller liturgical recognition.

The absence in St. John's Gospel of a narrative of Institution has resulted in a comparative underestimation of the sacramental value of his chapters

dealing with the Upper Room. These chapters form a glorious treasury of divine Table Talk. And they acquire a new meaning when read in the light of the new Passover, the Institution of which the writer takes for granted. The love of Jesus for His own, the love which He hopes will prevail between His disciples themselves, the footwashing, the tender comfort He offers, the idea of union and communion, the reference to His death, His coming again, the Father's house, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the need His people will have of being as constantly nourished by Him as the branches by the vine, the efficacy of His name in prayer,—these and other themes are singularly germane to the Sacrament. The great intercessory prayer of Jesus at the Table is an impressive and beautiful precedent for specially full and fervent intercession being made at every subsequent Communion.

The mention of the Fourth Gospel suggests the notorious difficulty about the relations between the dates of the Jewish Passover and Christ's Supper. Different theories have been devised. One represents Christ as having taken the liberty, justifiable on His part in the special circumstances, of holding the Paschal Meal a day earlier than that on which it was held in the city generally. Another explains the matter by a supposed corruption of the ter-

minology of the date. A third asserts that Christ was more accurate than the Jewish authorities in His selection of the date. One thing is certain: the feasibility of these and other theories frees us from being compelled to acknowledge any real discrepancy between the Fourth and the other Gospels.

As for references in the Gospels subsequent to the Resurrection, there is a likely one in the Emmaus incident. "And it came to pass, as He sat at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And they told . . . how He was known of them in the breaking of bread."[1]

This reference is much disputed; but there are as good authorities in favour of its being Eucharistical as on the contrary side. The similarity of the style of expression used in the accounts of the Institution and of that used here is remarkable. It matters not that these disciples are not recorded to have been present at the Institution. They may have been present as onlookers. And if that be unlikely, nothing is more likely than that they had learned of what transpired on that memorable night in the Upper Room.

One last reference, and we take farewell of the Gospels meanwhile. Can we doubt that when the risen Saviour gave His world-commission to His

[1] Luke xxiv. 30, 35.

Apostles, and enjoined them to teach all nations "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded," among the things which He consciously contemplated, nay, which He actually specified, was not only the initiatory Rite which He is expressly recorded to have mentioned, but also that other Sacrament which was to be so eloquent a witness both of His dying love and of His perpetual presence?

The first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles shows us the group of the disciples in "an upper room,"[1] and it has been urged that no upper room could form a more congenial and likely meeting-place than the apartment hallowed by memories of the Lord's Supper. That the company hastened to engage in a joyful observance of a Sacrament is not improbable. At all events they lost no time in enjoining the observance upon converts, who "continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers."[2]

A few verses later we read that the believers, "breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."[3] Although κλῶντες ἄρτον may mean the breaking of bread in the sense of partaking of an ordinary meal,

[1] Acts i. 13. [2] Acts ii. 42. [3] Acts ii. 46, 47.

yet the proximity of the expression to that in ver. 42, as well as the religious tone of the whole text, leads us to believe that what is referred to is the Eucharist and its Spiritual Meat. The observance may have been daily; it was at least weekly. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them. When he therefore had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even until break of day, so he departed."[1]

Passing to the Epistles, we find the richest store of reference in the First to the Corinthians. In the 5th chapter we read: "For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with the old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." While this passage might have been penned even although no Sacrament had been instituted (the Passover sacrifice being found in the Crucified Victim, and the feast in the Christian life, which under the Gospel wears an unintermittently festal character), yet it is natural to suppose that besides these ideas the new Passover is also in the Apostle's mind. When St. Paul says that the fathers "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all

[1] Acts xx. 7, 11.

eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ";[1] he is connecting Old Testament spiritual experience with that New Testament experience enjoyed in the Gospel Sacraments. A few verses later his reference becomes explicit. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."[2]

Then, after a comparison of Israel's altar and heathen altars with the Lord's Table, he proceeds: "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the table of devils."[3] Here we may note, besides the expression the Cup of the Lord, the first mention of the Sacrament as the Lord's Table, just as the next chapter gives us the first occurrence of the name The Lord's Supper. "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper."[4] The matter in question, of course, is the Agapé, followed by the Eucharist, and the abuses that had unhappily sprung up in Corinth, where greed on the part of the poor, inconsiderate-

[1] 1 Cor. x. 1–4. [2] Ver. 16. [3] Ver. 21. [4] 1 Cor. xi. 20.

ness on the part of the rich, not to mention the gluttony and drunkenness of individuals, had done so much to mar the fine order of the feast, and to prejudice the discerning of the Lord's Body. Such carnality and lack of love are calculated to quench "the selfsame Spirit that divides to every man severally as He will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, . . . and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."[1] The close way in which this last phrase "to drink into one Spirit" follows what is said about membership by baptism, leads us to recognise an allusion to the Sacramental Cup.

Other Epistles there are in which we may discover references to abuses of the Love-feast and the Communion. In Eph. v. the exhortations concerning religious assemblies (in which the Eucharist was usually observed) and concerning the giving of thanks (εὐχαριστοῦντες) warrant us in finding a reference to our subject in the counsel, "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit."[2] Writing of antinomians, St. Jude remarks: "These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves with-

[1] 1 Cor. xii. 11–13. [2] Eph. v. 18.

out fear,"[1]—without fear of eating and drinking judgment to themselves. And similarly St. Peter stigmatises riotous livers: "Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings while they feast with you."[2] Through several verses the denunciations of these spoilers of the Feast are almost identical in St. Peter and St. Jude.

There is a passage in Hebrews worth noticing in the present connection: "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."[3] Sacramentalists (like Sadler) naturally make the very most of this. But the inferences pressed by him and others of his school are forced; and we probably do well to identify this "altar" rather with Christ's Sacrifice than with the Lord's Table, or even the Cross. The Greek is θυσιαστήριον, the same word being used by St. Paul in the passage referred to above. In the instance now cited, the writer sees the Jew partake of the sacrifice offered upon the Temple Altar: these Jews have no right to partake of the benefits of Christ's Sacrifice if they persist in preferring to rely upon the antiquated system. That the writer to the Hebrews saw a certain resemblance between the Jewish Altar and the Christian Table, and that in a

[1] Jude 12. [2] 2 Pet. ii. 13. [3] Heb. xiii. 10.

figurative way he does here call the Table an Altar, is possible; but that does not involve us in the unevangelical sacrificial views of Sadler and of the Church of Rome. To say that the "altar" here is Calvary, or Christ's Heavenly Intercession, seems far-fetched; for neither at Calvary nor in heaven do we now eat in the physical sense in which both Jewish worshippers eat from their altar and Christians from their Table.

The First Epistle of St. John contains an interesting allusion. "This is He that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ: not by water only, but by water and blood . . . and there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."[1] "The water and the blood were always present in the Church in form of the sacraments, and the evangelist uses the sacraments here as witnesses to the historical reality of the life and experience of Jesus. Christian baptism answers to His baptism, the Christian feast in which faith partakes of the body and blood is a perpetual testimony to His Passion. . . . To deny the divine reality and saving significance of the Passion was to rob the most sacred rite of the Christian religion at once of its basis and its import: it was to abolish the Lord's Supper. The Apostle

[1] 1 John v. 6, 8.

appeals to the Lord's Supper against such a view."[1]

With a single allusion to the Apocalypse of St. John we conclude these New Testament quotations. It is a celestial Lord's Supper, a spiritual reality answering to the earthly Sacrament, to which the writer thus refers: "Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife hath made herself ready. . . . And He saith unto me, write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb."[2]

[1] Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 277. [2] Rev. xix. 7, 9.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY FATHERS

THE so-called Apostolic Fathers (Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, Hermas, Polycarp, Papias) carry us into the sub-Apostolic age. Amongst the main articles of the Christianity of this time was, according to Harnack, "the common offering of prayer, culminating in the Lord's Supper."[1] The authority of the first Apostles was sacred and supreme. Polycarp reminds the Philippians of their obligation to obey the teaching of "the blessed and renowned Paul."[2] Papias lost no opportunity of inquiring of any who had heard the Apostles about the discourses of the elders—"what was said by Andrew, or by Philemon, or by Thomas or James, or by John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples."[3] Ignatius hopes "that ye all by name come together in common in the faith, and in Jesus Christ . . . breaking the same bread, which is the

[1] *History of Dogma*, i. p. 164.
[2] *Phil.* iii.
[3] Euseb. *H. E.* iii.

medicine of immortality."[1] "Wherefore let it be your endeavour to partake all of the same holy Eucharist; for there is not the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the cup, in the unity of His blood: the altar."[2]

Clement of Rome (90 A.D.) has the following: "We ought to do all things in order, whatsoever the Lord has commanded us to perform at stated times: the Oblations and Liturgies to be celebrated, and that they should not take place at random, or disorderly, but at definite times and hours. . . . Our sin will not be small if we reject from the episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily offered the gifts."[3]

Especially interesting at this point is the *Didaché*, or *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, or (in the fuller title) *The Teaching of the Lord, through the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles.*

In his work, *The Church of the Sub-Apostolic Age*, Heron dates the *Didaché* "not later than the opening of the second century, and it may have been a good deal earlier."[4] The chapters bearing on the Eucharist (ix., x., xiv.) may be reproduced here in their entirety.

[1] *Eph.* xx. [2] *Phil.* iv. [3] *Ep. to Cor.* chaps. xl., xliv.
[4] P. 83. Cf. Bartlet's art. "Didaché" in Extra Vol. of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

"IX. And concerning the Eucharist, after this manner give thanks. First concerning the cup: We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David thy son, which thou madest known to us through Jesus thy Son: to thee be glory for ever. And concerning the broken bread: We thank thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou madest known to us through Jesus thy Son: to thee be glory for ever. As this broken bread was scattered abroad upon the mountains, and, when gathered together, became one, so let the Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom: for thine is the glory of the power through Jesus Christ for ever. But let no one eat or drink of the Eucharist but those baptized into the name of the Lord: for concerning this the Lord hath said, Give not that which is holy to the dogs."

"X. And, after being filled, give thanks after this manner: We thank thee, Holy Father, for thy holy name which thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy Son: to thee be glory for ever. Thou, O Almighty Saviour, didst create all things for thy name's sake, and thou gavest both food and drink to men for their enjoyment, that they might thank thee; but to us thou freely gavest spiritual food and

drink and life everlasting through thy Son. Before all things we thank thee that thou art mighty: thine is the glory for ever. Remember, O Lord, thy Church to deliver her from all evil, and to perfect her in thy love; and gather her together from the four winds, sanctified unto thy kingdom which thou didst prepare for her: for thine is the power and the glory for ever. Let grace come and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any one is holy, let him come; if any one is not holy, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen. But allow the prophets to give thanks in such terms as they wish."

"XIV. On the day of the Lord, being assembled together, break bread and give thanks, after confession of your trespasses, that our sacrifice may be pure, and let no one who has a dispute with his companion come with you till they are reconciled, that our sacrifice may not be defiled. For this is the command given by the Lord: 'In every place and time offer unto me a pure sacrifice: for I am a great King, and my name is Wonderful among the Gentiles.'"[1]

Assuming that these passages refer not merely to the Love-feast, but to the Lord's Supper, we may recognise the following outstanding features. The Eucharist constituted the highest act of Christian

[1] Heron, *ut supra.*

worship. It was observed every Lord's Day. From the expression "after being filled" it was associated with the Love-feast. Although a consecration of the elements is not specifically clear, yet it is implied in the solemn thanksgiving, such thanksgiving being equivalent to blessing, as we may infer from the virtual synonymity of εὐλογήσας in Matt. xxvi. 26, and εὐχαριστήσας in 1 Cor. xi. 24.

The joyous and thankful nature of the Rite is emphasised in the choice of the title "the Eucharist." The Sacrament is only for the holy, a reminder which recurs in the later expression ἅγια ἁγίοις, *Sancta sanctis*, in the "fencing of the tables." Contrition for sin and love to the brethren are requisites for worthy participation. And in the prescribed prayers, along with the recommendation of free prayers, we remark the germs of liturgy as well as primitive spontaneity. And these features are eminently Apostolic, and except the Agapé and the weekly celebration entirely catholic.

Respecting the first half of the second century, we turn to Justin Martyr (*c.* 120–165) as our next witness. In his *Apology* addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius he writes: "And after we have thus (in baptism) bathed the person who has become a believer and adherent, we lead him to the brethren, as they are called, where they are assembled to offer

up common prayers earnestly on behalf of themselves and the newly enlightened one and all others everywhere, that it may be vouchsafed to us who have learned the truth to be found also in our conduct good members of the society, and keepers of the commandments, that we may be saved with the eternal salvation. Then when we have done our prayers we greet one another with a kiss. Then there is presented to the president of the brethren a loaf and a cup of water and wine; and he, after taking them, offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost; and he gives thanks at length for these favours of God to us. And when he has ended the prayers and the thanksgiving (Eucharist) the whole assistant people present assent with an 'Amen'—a Hebrew word meaning 'so be it'; and when the president has given thanks, and the whole people have assented, those who are called deacons (ministers) among us receive a portion of the loaf and wine and water, over which the thanksgiving has been made, to each of those who are present, and they take it away to those who are not.

"And this food is called among us Eucharist; and no one is allowed to partake of it unless he believes that what we teach is true, and has been washed in the laver for the remission of sins, and for regenera-

tion, and is living as Christ enjoined. For we do not receive these things as common bread or common drink, but just as Jesus Christ our Saviour, by the Word of God made flesh, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so we have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given by the word of prayer which comes from Him—that food from which our blood and our flesh are by assimilation nourished—is both the flesh and the blood of that Jesus Christ who was made flesh. For the Apostles delivered in the memoirs compiled by them, which are called Gospels, that this command was given to them—that Jesus took bread."

Here we notice these essentials for Communion,—belief in the truths generally taught, baptism, and Christian living. Besides these New Testament essentials, we detect a suggestion of the Mixed Chalice and of Reservation. What is exactly meant by "thanks given by the word of prayer which comes from Him"? Is it some form of words orally handed down identical with or additional to those recorded in the New Testament? Is it the Lord's Prayer? Is it, as Gore thinks, some formula of benediction (like that implied in Irenæus' phrase "word of God") bestowed upon the bread and the cup? Rather, perhaps, it is no literal formula at all, but an expression referring to the "thanks" and

"blessing" made by Christ in words not reported verbatim.

With Irenæus, who was raised to the Bishopric of Lyons in 177 A.D., we move from the East to the West and advance well into the latter half of the second century. The sacrificial value of the people's offerings now becomes more accentuated, and the way is prepared for a transition from the mere offering of the creature elements for sacrificial and charitable uses to the offering of the consecrated host. "It is not that sacrifices as a whole have been abolished, but only that the law of sacrifices has been changed. . . . Sacrifices do not sanctify a man; but his conscience who offers, being pure, sanctifies the sacrifices."[1]

The second century draws to a close with the conversion of Tertullian. Although Tertullian speaks of the Eucharist as celebrated before daylight, that is not to say that its dissociation from the Agapé was now invariable. The famous passage from the *Apologeticus* descriptive of the Agapé will bear repetition. "Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it love (*Agapé*). Whatever it costs, our outlay in the name of piety is gain, since with the good things of the feast we benefit the needy. . . . The participants, before reclining, taste

[1] *Contra Hær.* iv. 18.

first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as benefits the chaste. They say, it is enough, as those who remember that even during the night they have to worship God; they talk as those who know that the Lord is one of their auditors. After the washing of hands and the bringing of lights, each is asked to stand forth and sing as he can a hymn to God, either one from the Holy Scriptures or one of his own composing,—a test of the measure of our drinking. As the feast commenced with prayer, so with prayer it closed. We go from it, not like troops of mischief-doers, nor bands of roamers, nor to break out into licentious acts, but to have as much care of our modesty and charity as if we had been at a school of virtue rather than a banquet."[1]

In dealing with the Eucharist, stress is laid by Tertullian on its efficacy to cleanse our bodies, to impart the "antidote of immortality," and to nourish them for immortal life; and reference is made to communicants as being "fed in the richness of the Lord's Body": a line of thinking which, though it has a measure of truth, contributed to that magical theory of the Sacrament which henceforth begins to wax strong.

As the third century proceeds, the language used

[1] *Apol.* chap. xxxix.

of the Eucharist becomes more realistic, as with St. Hippolytus, who writes, "His precious and pure Body and Blood which are daily prepared in His mystical divine table. . . . His own divine flesh and His precious blood He hath given us, He says, to eat and drink for the remission of sins."[1] In the East, however, says Harnack, "we possess no proof that before the time of Eusebius (who died in 340 A.D.) there is any idea of the offering of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper." In the case of Origen it is rather the spiritualising, allegorising tendency that dominates his view of the Sacrament, which is a means of mystical contemplation and of the "nourishing word of the truth." It is when we come to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (who died in 258 A.D.), that we cross a rubicon of opinion upon our subject.

[1] Gallandi, ii.

CHAPTER IV

RISE AND GROWTH OF THE SACRIFICIAL IDEA

THE matter of prime interest to Cyprian was the exclusively esoteric character of the officiating Christian minister and of his functions. In short, Cyprian carried over Old Testament ideas of priesthood into the New Testament ministry. And so he contends in connection with the Lord's Supper that "that priest is surely a true vicegerent of Christ who imitates that which Christ did; and he offers a true and full sacrifice to God the Father, if he begins to offer as he sees that Christ Himself is offered."[1] Cyprian "was the first to co-ordinate a specific sacrifice, namely, the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, with a specific priesthood. . . . He was the first to describe the 'Passion of the Lord,' nay, the 'Blood of Christ' and the 'Dominica Hostia,' as the material of the Eucharistic oblation."[2]

Every celebration of the Lord's Supper is a

[1] *Ep.* lxiii.

[2] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 390.

repetition or imitation of His sacrifice of Himself, and the ceremony has an expiatory value. Henceforth this view continues to gain ground, although several centuries pass before the doctrine of Transubstantiation is definitely and authoritatively fixed.

Our present scope does not permit of much citation from the various Fathers, such as Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Eusebius, writers who consecutively contribute to this view. The Romish contention, however, that the language used by the early Fathers is inconsistent with anything else than the now orthodox Romish view, is hardly accurate. The fact is that the thinking, say, of Augustine exhibits a certain vagueness on this subject. While passages in support of the Romish view might be cited, others might be employed to show how far he was from material literalism, as, for example, that in which Christ is said to be sacrificed in the Sacrament in a sense similar to that in which we say on Good Friday, "To-day is the passion of our Lord," or on Easter Day, "To-day Christ rose from the dead"; so that it is in the mere sense of "similitude" that the Sacrament implies the Sacrifice of Christ.[1] The name of Gregory the Great, however (550–604 A.D.), brings us to a stage at which what was arrived at by

[1] *Ep.* xxiii. ad Bonifac.

Cyprian "now dominates the whole religious conception."[1] The oblation of Christ's body is constantly repeated by the priest.

We are now fairly into the Middle Ages, a period in many ways favourable to superstitious developments. Miracles of all kinds were eagerly credited, and "the sacred act effected in the Lord's Supper had to be developed into the wonder of wonders."[2]

There is a marked increase in the tendency to find religion in ceremonies and institutions rather than in the original truth of God in Christ. The Christ of history receded into the background, the Christ of ecclesiastical dogma was more and more obtruded. The mystery of the Incarnation and Death was contemplated less ethically and spiritually, and more sacramentally and sensibly. There, upon the high altar, the Divine Saviour might be seen reincarnate and recrucified. Such were the views and sentiments held now by the majority, and still requiring to be theologically established, as they presently came to be, at the hands of the famous Paschasius Radbertus. The intricacies of the controversies in which he engaged do not concern us here. His great work on the Lord's Supper contains much that is true from a New Testament viewpoint, but it is he who for

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, v. 270. [2] *Ibid.*

the first time in the Church "declares without hesitancy that the sacramental body is that which had been born of Mary, and that this is due to a transformation which only leaves the sensuous appearance unchanged."[1] This is a miracle against nature, but not inconsistent with God's power. And yet it is not Paschasius who strikes the characteristic note of the Mass. It is the Incarnation rather than the Atonement that he sees repeated in the Sacrament. But those who wished to find in the Sacrament the repeated sacrificial Death, each repetition being propitiatory and God-appeasing, seized on Paschasius's theory with avidity, and applied it triumphantly to the Mass. "What could now approach the Mass? There was no need to alter the ancient wording of the missal prayers, which still, when they dealt with sacrifice, emphasised the sacrifice of praise; for who attended to words? The Mass as a sacrificial rite, in which the holiest thing conceivable was presented to God, had, however, ceased long ago to end in participation, but found its climax in the act that expiated sin and removed evil."[2]

It was not, however, till the year 1215 that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was ecclesiastically fixed. In that year, at the Fourth Lateran Council,

[1] Harnac, *History of Dogma*, v. 314. [2] *Ibid.* p. 322.

the mediæval doctrine of the Eucharist was solemnly framed as a binding dogma. The following *ipsissima verba* may be quoted: "Jesus Christ is at once priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrifice of the altar under the appearance of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood by divine power."

The next phase of thought upon the Sacrament is that of the Schoolmen. The speculations and dialectic of Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, while they furnished a kind of intellectual vindication of the Church's doctrine, contributed nothing substantially new, so far as our present purpose is concerned. It may, however, be mentioned as a result largely of the scholastic discussions, that now child-communion was discontinued; that the cup was withheld from the laity on the ground of Lombard's theory that the whole Christ is contained in each species; and that the customs of the adoration and the procession of the Host along with the feast of Corpus Christi were introduced. From this time the multiplication of Masses proceeds apace. Low Masses, at cheaper rates, obtained a notorious vogue. All the evils of the false doctrine of the Sacrament were swiftly afoot.

CHAPTER V

THE GREEK CHURCH

ALTHOUGH in a general historical sense the Greek Church has the precedence of the Latin, Christianity having originated in the East, we take the Greek Church after the Latin, in our present study, because of the less prompt and definite development of sacramental doctrine in the East. We possess no proof, says Harnack, that in the East there is any idea of the offering of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper before the time of Eusebius, who died in 340 A.D.

The Orthodox Eastern Church is "the aged tree beneath whose shade the rest of Christendom has sprung up." It is not surprising that the Christian inheritors of the Greek philosophy, with its tendency to define the abstract, and of the Greek language with its incomparable precision, should appear very early in the dogmatic arena; and if the Eastern Fathers were comparatively slow in fixing so concrete a theory of the Eucharist as Transubstantiation, the

explanation is perhaps to be found in the more mystical character of Greek as compared with Latin theology. They held, indeed, that "a spiritual mystical something is really present" in the Sacrament; but they were well aware of the danger of defining that something in too crass a fashion. The earlier Fathers, like Clement and Origen, were saved at least from crude materialism by the beautiful spirituality of the best Greek philosophy.

At this point we shall take the opportunity of referring to a matter the importance of which has, through Hatch[1] and others, been recently emphasised, namely, the influence of the Greek Mysteries upon the Christian Rite. Since the Old Testament Passover supplied our Lord with a sufficient starting-point for the new Passover, it cannot be supposed that He was in the remotest degree indebted to the classic Mysteries. Any real points of similarity between the Christian and the Pagan Rites are due to the fact that the fundamental religious need of man is ever the same, and that the heathen in their rites are seen groping after that which finds its highest satisfaction in Christianity. It is, however, quite evident that the Eastern development of the ritual of the Christian Sacrament was influenced by Greek Mysteries.

[1] *Greek Influence on Christianity.*

The Greek Mysteries, seen at their best in the Eleusinia of Athens at her prime, attempted through sensuous media to represent religious ideas, to convey instruction, and to quicken faith. The chief festival was held in honour of Demeter, the goddess of man's bread, and was mainly symbolical of the passage from death to life in nature and the soul. The purifications, fastings, sacrificial offerings, hymns, processions, dances, had an after counterpart in the ceremonial of the Christian Supper. The posset of barley-meal mingled with water and myrrh, which Demeter drank in the house of King Celeus, and which was given to her worshippers, bears a resemblance to the Christian Cup; as also does the pouring of water and wine from two vessels, one held toward the East, the other toward the West, some mystic words being at the same time recited. The hymn referring to the mystic holy child Iacchus, his death and resurrection, suggests a curious coincidence. Candidates for initiation must pass through a course of instruction, and must (like Christians in Baptism) make a procession to the seashore in order to be purified. None but the initiated could behold the mysteries, participation in which exercised a saving and healthful effect extending even to the next life. "Thrice happy they," says Sophocles, "who have been initiated before they die,

for theirs is the lot of life, and evil is it with the others." The qualifications of candidates required a freedom from notorious wickedness, unexpiated murder being an absolute bar. The Mysteries were held at night, like the primitive Lord's Supper.

So many striking resemblances between the pagan and the Christian Mysteries could not but influence the tendency of Greek feeling and practice in connection with the Communion, even although the pagan rites were so severely criticised and denounced by such writers as Clement of Alexandria. There was a disposition in some ecclesiastical quarters to adopt a little of what seemed good in the ancient ceremonies. And this disposition to some extent explains the more elaborate pomp and dramatic symbolism of the Eastern as compared with the Western Christian Rite.

In observing the course of Græco-Christian thought upon the Eucharist, we may begin with Clement of Alexandria (*c.* 150–220 B.C.). So academic a thinker as Clement, chiefly interested in knowledge as apprehended with the minimum of aid from sensuous media, was ever ready to interpret the sensuous in terms of the allegorical and symbolical. "The mystic symbol, then, of the Holy Blood, the Scripture hath called wine. . . . He (Christ) *allegorically* speaks of the Word who was poured

out for many for the forgiveness of sins, the holy Fount of joy. But that what was blessed was wine He showed again, saying to the disciples, 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine,' etc. But that what was drunk by the Lord was wine, He Himself says of Himself, upbraiding the Jews with boldness of heart."[1]

The spiritualising style of Clement appears in the following: "Twofold is the Blood of the Lord. The one is His natural Blood, by which we have been redeemed from destruction; the other, spiritual, *i.e.* wherewith we are anointed. And this is to drink the Blood of Jesus, to partake of the immortality of the Lord. But the virtue of the Word is the Spirit, as blood is of flesh. Analogously, then, the wine is mingled with the water and the spirit with the man. The one, the mingled drink, feasteth unto faith; the other, the Spirit, leadeth to immortality. And the mingling of both again, of the draught and the Word, is called Eucharist,—an admirable and beautiful grace whereof they who partake, according to faith, are sanctified both as to body and soul, the will of the Father mingling together mystically the Divine mixture, man, with the Spirit and the Word."[2] The nourishment of the Sacrament is specially connected by Clement

[1] *Pædag.* ii. 2. [2] *Ibid.* i. 5.

with the Word. "I am thy Nourisher, who give thee Myself as Bread. . . . I am thy Teacher in heavenly instruction."[1]

The noble-minded Origen (185–254 A.D.), whose life was one ceaseless effort after close fellowship with the Unseen and the Eternal, strove rather to ascend into the suprasensuous than to bring the Unseen down into the form of the sensuous. Speculation for the mind and ascetics for the body satisfied him much more than a ritual for the senses. For him the literal sense of Scripture was but a stepping-stone to the psychical and pneumatic. The sacramental bread is "the typical and symbolical body"; and it is so in virtue of the Word thus typified and symbolised. As the Logos was represented by Christ's appearance in the flesh, so now it is represented by the Eucharist, which is a substitute for His fleshly body. What Origen characteristically accentuates is the Word, the Truth which alone lends meaning to the symbol. "It is not the substance of the bread, but the word spoken over it, which benefits."[2] The food is of value as "the cause of the mind's perception." So all-important is the Word, and so secondary the material Rite, that "we are said to drink the Blood of Christ not

[1] *Quis dives salvetur?* § 23.
[2] *In St. Matth.* t. xi. n. 14.

only in the way of the Sacrament, but also when we receive His Word, in which is life, as also Himself saith: 'The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.'"[1] It is thus *ideas* more than *forms* that Origen magnifies.

It is not till we come to Eusebius of Cæsarea (264–340 A.D.; bishop, 315 A.D.) that we discover in the East any distinctly sacrificial view of the Eucharist. Instead of an offering of the memorial of the body, we now have an offering of the body itself (τὸ σῶμα προσφέρειν). Eusebius has in a sense the propitiatory memorial Sacrifice; but not in the sense of the later Mass. It is in thought, in faith, in prayer that the Sacrifice is presented before God; for "we offer the shewbread, *rekindling the saving remembrance.*"[2] But the elements are only *symbols*, *images*. "We ought to celebrate the memory of this Sacrifice (of the Cross) on the Table through the *symbols* of His Body and saving Blood, according to the laws of the New Covenant." Similar views continue to prevail till we come to the time of the great St. Basil of Cæsarea (329–379 A.D.), who himself was also genuinely Origenist.

Certain new notes are struck by St. Gregory of Nyssa (bishop, 370 A.D.), St. Gregory of Nazianzum (330–389 A.D.), and St. Cyril of Jerusalem (315–386 A.D.);

[1] *Hom. XVI.* [2] *In Ps.* xci.

all of whom use expressions that have been eagerly fastened upon by upholders of Transubstantiation. "The bread," says Gregory of Nyssa,[1] "sanctified by the word of God, is transmade (μεταποιεῖσθαι) into the Body of God the Word." But Pusey[2] well points out that this expression "transmade" is used by Gregory not to imply any change of substance, but merely to express in energetic fashion the *sacramental* character of the elements once common but now in a religious sense "transmade."

Cyril[3] uses the word μεταβέβληται. "We pray the gracious God that He will send down His Holy Spirit on the elements presented, in order that He may make the bread into the Body of Christ and the wine into the Blood of Christ; for what the Holy Spirit touches is wholly sanctified and transformed (μεταβεβλῆται)." But while Cyril's appeal to the miracle of Cana might suggest a literalism like that of the Romish theory, yet, on the other hand, his emphasis upon the need of faith, and his reference to the elements as *spiritual*, exclude the idea of Transubstantiation.

The Greek Father most responsible for a phase suggestive of Transubstantiation is St. Gregory Naz. His theory is called that of Transformation; and it

[1] *Orat. Catech.* c. 37. [2] *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, p. 186.
[3] *Catech.* v. 7.

arose from his anxiety to find in the Eucharist a continuation of the process of the Incarnation. As Christ's human body was transformed (μετεποιήθη) to Divine sublimity by the residence in it of the Divine Logos, so the bread is transformed into the Divine Body by the Presence vouchsafed through consecration. Although Gregory did not teach Transubstantiation in the later sense, the *form* only and not the substance of the elements being (in his view) changed, yet he it is whom Harnack declares responsible for all further developments, especially the liturgical, and for nominally Christian heathenism.

The illustrious St. John Chrysostom (347–407 A.D.) is nowhere more eloquent than upon the Sacrament. His theory is practically that of Gregory, but with a more materialistic phraseology. Some of his expressions exhibit a grossness not to be exceeded by any Latin theologian. But some allowance must be made on the score of the imaginative style of the language of the Golden-mouthed; and Pusey[1] is probably right in his exegesis of Chrysostom's phrase "reorder" (μεταῤῥυθμίζειν) as being used in a non-materialistic sense.

Dionysius the Areopagite (second half of fourth century) is of importance rather in connection with liturgies than dogmatics. A thorough Neoplatonist,

[1] Pusey, *Doctrine of Real Presence*, p. 211.

more mystical than literal, and interested theologically in the divine Principle behind the Rite, he was concerned for the Eucharist as one of the high mysteries whose value was largely ritual. The Eucharist is a great liturgical performance.

We have now all the materials necessary to explain the Greek Rite in its theory and practice. The realism of Gregory and the ritualism of Dionysius are seen in secure combination by the time of John of Damascus (*c.* 676–754 A.D.). By the Holy Spirit bread and wine are *received into* the Body of Christ. Not that the Body of Christ comes down from heaven, but the bread and wine are transformed into the Body of God. The Damascene's view was ratified by the Greek Church at the Second Nicene Council, 787 A.D., and represents what is still the classical doctrine of that Church. In spite of its resemblance to the Romish doctrine, the distinction must be kept in mind. The Greek theory may be called that of Insubstantiation as contrasted with Transubstantiation. As the Roman view suggests the idea of Christ's Body suddenly descending from heaven and taking the place of the elements, the Greek view represents the glorified Christ as assuming the transformed elements into Himself. It is often asserted that the Greek Church holds the Roman

doctrine, but His Excellency Joannes Gennadios has recently quoted with approval the statement of the late Dean Stanley, that Transubstantiation "if used at all (by the Greek Church) as a theological term, is merely one amongst many to express the reverential awe with which the Eucharist is approached."[1] The distinction, somewhat subtle, no doubt, may be expressed in the words of Dorner:[2] "The Greek doctrine remains distinct from the Romish Transubstantiation. The latter makes the elements to be annihilated as to substance, and merely the semblance—the species, figure, of the same—to be left. The Greeks endeavour so to interpret the miracle as to suppose the elements to continue, while holding a transference of them to the substance of the Body and Blood, whereby they become accidents of this other substance. The transformation is therefore to be regarded as an implanting in another substance. . . . The Greeks, however, notwithstanding the analogy of the Incarnation suggested here, reject the hypostatic union of Christ with the elements. The obverse, then, of this implanting in Christ's Body and Blood is that Christ's Body and Blood sustain the elements and are present under their veil." The Greeks thus

[1] Chambers's *Encyclopædia*, art. on "Greek Church."
[2] *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv. 315 (Clark's translation).

escape such an identification of the elements with Christ as would make the same happen to Christ's Body and Blood as happens to the elements, say, in the act of partaking. In one word, then, the Greek *μετουσίωσις* is not the Latin *transubstantio.*

Other points of difference between the Greek and Latin Churches are the use in the former of leavened bread, communion in both kinds, and children's participation, Confirmation following Baptism. Both Churches are at one in considering the Eucharist to be a propitiatory sacrifice.

It was, amongst other considerations, perhaps the resemblance of the Greek Insubstantiation to the Lutheran Consubstantiation that led Melanchthon and, in 1576, the Tübingen divines to make their fruitless efforts in favour of union with the Eastern Church. Equally regrettable was the failure of Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople in 1621, to accomplish reform of the Greek Church and union with the Protestant. He corresponded with Archbishop Laud, and in 1629 issued a somewhat Calvinistic Confession. His views were repudiated at a Synod of Jerusalem in 1672. The nineteenth century has seen several not unsuccessful efforts in the direction of intercommunion between the Greek and the Anglican Churches. In 1874 the English House of Convocation reappointed a committee to

"establish such relations between the two communions as shall enable the laity and clergy of either to join in the sacraments and offices of the other without forfeiting the communion of their own Church." The Greek response, however, seems to be more of a merely amicable than a thoroughgoing nature.

CHAPTER VI

REFORMATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

AT no time, prior to the Reformation at least, did the Church of Rome exhibit unanimity upon the views which received an authoritative imprimatur in 1215. We know how strenuously Retramnus opposed Radbertus in the ninth century, and what controversial activity prevailed amongst the Schoolmen of the thirteenth. In the latter half of the thirteenth century, a return to scriptural simplicity was nobly persisted in by the Waldenses. The fourteenth century gave birth to some vigorous personalities, often styled pre-Reformers, such as John Wycliffe and John Huss, not to mention the less theological Girolamo Savonarola. The schism in the Church consequent upon the rival papacies in 1378 must have seriously impaired ecclesiastical authority, and it certainly encouraged Wycliffe in his attacks upon established opinions. Learned, accomplished, industrious, and fearless, he at length in 1380

assailed the dogma of Transubstantiation, and that in so formidable a fashion as to call for condemnation by the Archbishop of Canterbury's Council, and for repudiation thirty-five years later by the Council of Constance. Through the medium of the Bohemian Queen Anne's retinue, Wycliffe's views reached John Huss, who based much of his own preaching and writing upon the Englishman's works, and the flames of whose martyrdom cast a lurid light upon the dogmatic intolerance of Rome. In Italy, Savonarola's revolt against the papal authority, though more ethical than doctrinal, was not without its influence upon Luther. Erasmus's New Testament caused attention to be turned to the original teaching upon the Sacraments, and to the accounts of the Institution of the Supper. But, of course, it was the doctrine of justification by faith, discovered and applied by Luther and others, that proved the irresistible solvent of the superstitious system connected with the Mass. The evangelic doctrine, bringing the soul face to face with God in Jesus Christ as He is offered to us in the gospel, at once annihilates a system of mechanical and magical means of grace and of salvation merited and achieved by Mass, said or paid for; a system of assurance proportionate to the multiplication of the Masses; a system of a redemptive work without finality, and

of a sacerdotalism that stood between the soul and its redeeming God.

The incarnate and atoning Saviour was once again to be found, in the prime and fundamental sense, not in the spectacle transacted at the altar, but through that faith which is the direct gift of God to the soul; that faith by which the Son of God is savingly revealed "in me"; that faith which finds its fixed point of support in the sacrifice of Calvary, where Christ offered Himself once for sins; and not in its symbolic repetition, however wonderfully edifying and precious that mystic Memorial and Fellowship may be. Thus, in one word, the gospel was recovered for the world, and with the gospel a true and pure doctrine of the Sacraments.

Canon Gore[1] admits that Luther's theory is "a very ambiguous matter." The usual designation applied to it, Consubstantiation, is deprecated by Lutheran divines, although for want of a better we may consider ourselves warranted in persisting in it; especially as it appears in the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent deliverance upon the ritualistic controversy, *à propos* of which the Lutheran view claims special attention at the present moment.

But, first, let us recollect the temperamental and intellectual factors which helped to determine the

[1] *The Body of Christ.*

great German's attitude to the subject. In Luther's temperament there was a deep vein of conservative sentiment, which disposed him to cling to whatever in the old religion he was not forced by his root-principles to discard. The Roman Catholic view of the Presence in the Sacrament continued to be invested with a certain glamour in his eyes. "Good rough old Martin Luther" had, besides, a liking for the concrete; or, in other words, "he felt most deeply the importance of the objective means of grace." Intellectually, again, Luther's strength did not lie in metaphysics. Philosophically, he remained to the end under the influence of the Schoolmen, whose subtle distinctions and intricate dialectic he was not best fitted to employ, as unhappily he attempted to do in his Eucharistical controversy with Zwingli. Had he in this province only preserved his earlier manner, had he made no *mauvais pas*, there would have been little to regret. Indeed, his views as first expressed were singularly "low." That the Sacraments are of service for the forgiveness of sins and for nothing else; that they do not become efficacious by their being celebrated, but by their being believed in; that they are a peculiar form of the saving *Word of God:* to so much, the Swiss divines might have offered little objection. On the other hand, had

Zwingli shown less appearance of naked rationalism, Luther's passions might never have been aroused on the subject in such a way as to whirl him into a vortex of theological confusion. In fairness to Luther, it is also hinted by Harnack that his later and more Romish view was to some extent in the nature of a protest against certain general tendencies and projects arising out of tenets held by Zwingli, Carlstadt, and Schwenfeld, "great political plans and dangerous forms of uncertainty as to what evangelical faith is":[1] although it is hardly like Harnack's fearless passion for truth ("theology" he asserts, "will not be mocked") to prefer that Luther should have fallen into errors, rather than that a reconciliation with these Protestant opponents should have entailed certain unwelcome ecclesiastical and political combinations. In any case, Luther went on to "complete" his doctrine of the Eucharist. It appeared to him that the most effective way to combat the subjective excess now imminent was to teach the Presence of the bodily Christ in the Eucharist. In this effort he seemed to see as through a haze, and with a strange fascination, the words which in answer to Zwingli he afterwards wrote in chalk upon the table: "This is My body."

The process by which Luther arrived at his

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vii. 260.

position might be summarised thus. The objective view of the Sacrament as a genuine means of saving benefit must be vindicated against the Quietists. The frankest method of vindication is to teach the bodily Presence. Now this Presence can be none other than that of the exalted Christ, whose glorified Body must therefore be ubiquitous (Occam's Scholasticism). The Eucharist, then, is the parallel to the Incarnation (Paschasius Radbertus again). As Godhead and humanity are blended in the Incarnation, so the whole Christ is united with the untransubstantiated yet consubstantiated elements (Nominalism invoked). Result:—That in and with the bread the Body of Christ is truly partaken of; that accordingly all that takes place actively and passively in the bread takes place actively and passively in the Body of Christ; "that the latter is distributed, eaten, and masticated with the teeth." The Lutheran Church thus began to relapse into a "miserable doublette"[1] of the Roman. The train of evils need not be specified. In justice, however, to Luther himself, it should be said that in his own case this decadent view never detached him from the original evangelical truths which it is his glory to have rediscovered for the world.

Into this position Luther might never have been

[1] Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vii. 265.

driven, but for the drastic pressure of Zwingli. With the utmost admiration for the singularly fresh and attractive mind and spirit of the bold Swiss, we must admit that Luther had grounds for his suspicion and distrust of Zwingli's earlier tendencies. The Zurich reformer's break with traditionalism seemed too radical. His earlier view of the Supper as a mere memorial was too rationalistic, too irreligious. But there is surely some perversity in the obstinate disinclination of Anglican writers to make full allowance for Zwingli's return to the richer conception, which is categorically affirmed in these sentences of his own: "If I have called this a commemoration, I have done so in order to controvert those who make of it a sacrifice." "We believe that Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper; yea, that there is no communion without such presence. . . . We believe that the true Body of Christ is eaten in the Communion, not in a gross and carnal manner, but in a spiritual and sacramental manner, by the religious, believing, and pious heart."[1]

These words have the true Genevan ring; and we turn now to the mighty Calvin for light and leading. What could better equip a thinker for dealing with our subject than the theological grasp, the exegetical fidelity, the spiritual insight, the

[1] Confession addressed to King Francis.

dialectical skill which were exhibited in such brilliant combination by John Calvin? His views are fully and clearly stated in the famous *Institutes*, in the *Short Treatise on the Supper of our Lord*, in his *Catechism of the Church of Geneva*, not to mention various tracts and pamphlets. In the *Institutes*,[1] the author furnishes a trenchant refutation of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, along with a vigorous statement of his own view, which he maintains to be scriptural and orthodox. Calvin's amplification of his view is, of course, replete with most valuable matter. But the view itself *simpliciter* can be stated here briefly in words of his own. "There are two things in the Supper, viz. bread, and wine, which are seen by the eyes, handled by the hands, and perceived by the taste; and Christ by whom our souls are inwardly fed, as with their own proper aliment." "A true communication of Jesus Christ is presented to us in the Supper."[2] "The internal substance of the Sacrament is conjoined with the visible signs; and as the bread is distributed to us by the hand, so the Body of Christ is communicated to us, in order that we may be made partakers of it."[3] "The

[1] Specially bk. iv. chap. xvii.
[2] *Catechism Tracts*, ii. 91 (Translation Society).
[3] *Short Treatise Tracts*, ii. 170.

spiritual means whereby the bread and wine become to us the Body and Blood are faith on the part of the communicant; the Holy Spirit carrying us to heaven, that we may there behold Christ in the glory of His kingdom; and the energy of Christ, who can manifest His presence by the exercise of His power, wherever He pleases, in earth or heaven."

All this should suffice to rebut Wilberforce's charge that in Calvin's view "there is little that goes beyond the system of Zwingli's"[1] (Zwinglianism being construed by Wilberforce in the inadequate manner so frequent). We must also qualify Dorner's criticism, that "Calvin is unable to apply to the Holy Supper the exaltation of the God-man to freedom from space in relation to His working."[2] The very positive force of Calvin's view may be felt in a specimen passage from the *Institutes:* "Christ is the only food of our soul, and therefore our Heavenly Father invites us to Him, that, refreshed by communion with Him, we may ever and anon gather new vigour until we reach the heavenly immortality. But as the mystery of the secret union of Christ with believers is incomprehensible by nature, He exhibits its figure and image in visible signs adapted to our capacity,

[1] *Lord's Supper*, p. 247.
[2] *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv. 321 (Eng. trans.).

nay, by giving, as it were, earnests and badges, He makes it as certain to us as if it were seen by the eye; the familiarity of the symbol giving it access to minds however dull, and showing that our souls are fed by Christ just as the corporeal life is sustained by bread and wine. We now, therefore, understand the end which this mystical benediction has in view, namely, to assure us that the body of Christ was once sacrificed for us, so that we may now eat it, and, eating, feel within ourselves the efficacy of that one sacrifice,—that His blood was once shed for us so as to be our perpetual drink. This is the force of the promise which is added, "Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you." The body which was once offered for our salvation we are enjoined to take and eat; that while we see ourselves made partakers of it, we may safely conclude that the virtue of that death will be made efficacious in us. Hence He terms the cup the covenant in His blood. For in the covenant which He once sanctioned by His blood He in a manner renews, or rather continues, in so far as regards the confirmation of our faith, as often as He stretches forth His sacred blood as drink to us."[1]

Our survey of German and Swiss parties in the controversy may be concluded by a reference to

[1] *Institutes*, bk. iv. chap. xvii.

those efforts after compromise connected with the names of Bucer and Melanchthon. Bucer followed a *via media* between Luther and Zwingli. It seemed at Wittenburg in 1536 that an agreement between Bucer and Luther was possible. But fresh difficulties arising, the Strasburg theologian left the scene of debate and passed to England. Melanchthon's view of the Lord's Supper approximated more to that of Calvin than to that of Luther; and he laboured earnestly, in connection with the Augsburg Confession (1530), to reconcile Lutheranism and Calvinism. The Confessio Variata, submitted by Melanchthon in 1540, and containing modifications that tended further towards Calvinism, incensed the more thoroughgoing Lutherans so implacably as to make in German Protestantism a permanent schism, visible to-day in the distinction between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches.

Meanwhile the lucid and convincing views of Calvin gained an increasing hold upon European Protestantism. The Genevan influence was most marked in the Churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, England and Scotland. Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli, led his party to an agreement with Calvin,—an agreement which found formulation in the Zurich Confession of 1549 and the Helvetic Consensus of 1675.

CHAPTER VII

DEVELOPMENT OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINE IN ENGLAND

THE coins of our realm bear a curious witness to Reformation controversies upon Sacramental doctrine. The letters "Fid. Def." appended to the royal name, and preserving the title of Defender of the Faith, first granted by Leo x. to Henry VIII., recall the theological passage of arms which took place between the English king and the German Reformer. In his work on the Sacraments (1521), Luther had made a certain departure from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and drew forth Henry's book, *The Babylonian Captivity*, in defence of the Romish theory. This royal effort, more vituperative than dialectical, hardly bears out Erasmus's high opinion of the monarch's learned accomplishments. Its temper, certainly, is enough to explain how it was possible in 1523 for Frith to have been burned at Smithfield for the Zwinglianism advocated in his *Lytle Treatise* on the Sacraments. Political

exigencies, however, were destined to increase King Henry's Protestantism; and when in 1536 the Ten Articles were promulgated by royal command, their definition of the Sacrament was not un-Lutheran. But an anti-Protestant reaction caused the Ten to be superseded by the Six Articles of 1529, in which Transubstantiation was revived. The accession of Edward VI. in 1547 gave free scope to the Protestant leanings of Archbishop Cranmer, who must have been instrumental in the passing of an Act of Parliament entitled "An Acte against all suche as shall unreverentlie speake against the Sacrament of the bodie and bloude of Christe commonlie called the Sacrament of the Altar, and for the receiving thereof in both kyndes."

In March 1548 appeared "The Order of the Communion." "Merely such parts of the Communion Service as this short formulary contains were in English, because they alone related particularly to the general communicant. All the previous portions of the ceremony, and even the consecration of the elements as well as the receiving of them by the priest himself, continued still in Latin."[1] This Order, remarkable for its simplicity, does not undervalue the Sacrament as a channel of grace, and yet it is free from materialistic

[1] Rev. W. Clay on the Prayer-Book.

features. God "doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and mystery to give us his said body and blood spiritually, and to feed and drink upon." A note directs that in respect of the consecrated Breads "men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesu Christ." There is to be no "levation or lifting up."

In 1549 a fuller compilation appeared, entitled "The booke of the common prayer and administracion of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche: after the use of the Churche of England." In the section "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion commonly called the Mass," the attitude of thought indicated in the Order is emphasised. The Epiklesis runs thus: "And with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." The wine in the chalice is mixed with "a little pure and clean water." The bread is unleavened, and it is to be received by the people "in their mouths," not in their hands, lest it be conveyed secretly away and "abused to superstition and wickedness." And "there shall always some communicate with the priest that ministereth." The expressions

"Altar," "Lord's Table," "God's Board" occur indiscriminately.

Meanwhile there had arrived in England, in accordance with the desires of Cranmer, the continental reforming scholars Peter Martyr, Bernardino Ochino, and Martin Bucer. These now lent their influence in favour of a still more Protestant version of the Prayer-Book. Bucer had already assisted Melanchthon in preparing an Order of Service for Archbishop Hermann of Cologne; and his hand makes itself felt in the version of 1552. The word "Altar" now disappears from the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion; and directions are given that "the Table, having at the time of Communion a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel." The form of the Epiklesis is slightly attenuated: "Grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood." Greater stress is laid upon the necessity of there being a number of communicants present with the priest. Kneeling during reception is enjoined, but only for the purpose of order and reverence; and adoration of the elements is to be abhorred as

idolatry. The Calvinistic view of the Presence is pointedly stated: "As concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true and natural body to be in more places than in one at one time." Any "real and essential presence" of Christ's "natural flesh and blood" is ruled out.

In *A Short Catechysme* for schoolmasters (1553) we find this doctrinal statement: "The Supper is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ: forasmuch as the bread representeth his body, betrayed to be crucified for us; the wine standeth in stead and place of his blood, plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished; so by the body, that is, the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life. . . . These things come to pass by a certain secret mean and lively working of the Spirit: when we believe that Christ hath once for all given up his body and blood for us, to make a sacrifice and most pleasant offering to his heavenly Father; and also when we confess and acknowledge him as our only Saviour, high Bishop, Mediator, and Redeemer. . . . Faith is the mouth of the soul, whereby we receive this heavenly meat, full both of salvation and im-

mortality, dealt among us by means of the Holy Ghost."

As King Edward's Prayer-Books formed the basis of those of Queen Elizabeth, so did the Forty-two "Articles agreed upon in the Convocation and published by the King's Majesty" form the basis of the present Thirty-nine Articles. Our last quotation from Edward VI. shall be the Twenty-ninth Article, which treats of the Lord's Supper: "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as worthily, rightly, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a communion of the Body of Christ; likewise the Cup of Blessing is a communion of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of Christ's Body and Blood, cannot be proved from Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth that the body of one and the selfsame man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some one certain place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as Holy Scripture doth teach)

Christ was taken up into heaven, and shall there continue unto the end of the world; a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinance to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped."

Calvinistic doctrine could not be more unequivocally expressed than in these significant extracts. Had Edward's Prayer-Books and Articles remained unmodified by Elizabethan action, whatever might have been their divisive effect in the English Church at the time, much nineteenth century and current controversy arising from the designed ambiguity of the present formularies would clearly have been avoided.

In one of the recent Oxford Church Text-Books, the Rev. B. J. Kyd observes that "it is probable that the Forty-two Articles had not synodical authority." When, in 1554, Cranmer was taxed by Weston for having set them forth "in the name of the Synod of London," the Archbishop's reply was that "I was ignorant of the setting to of that title, and as soon as I had knowledge thereof I did not like it." When, in 1552, the King issued letters to the Bishops to compel subscription, he made no

reference to the "Synod of London," but only to the fact that the Articles had been "devised and gathered with great study, and by the learned and good advice of the greatest part of the Bishops of the realm, and sundry others of our clergy." Those, therefore, in the Church of England at the present day who dislike the Edwardian Articles have some ground for contending that "the Church of England was not committed to them, even for the brief space of seven weeks which elapsed between their publication by the authority of Edward VI. and his death."[1]

It takes some time before the ideas of studious thinkers and ecclesiastical courts permeate the masses. The doctrines of the scholars and Reformers favoured by King Edward had not found lodgment in the general mind before the Mass, with Henry VIII.'s form of service, was restored under Queen Mary in 1553.

Influenced by the new learning which she had studied under Roger Ascham, Queen Elizabeth, though as princess she had conformed to the ascendant rites, came to the throne with opinions decidedly Protestant, if considerably Lutheran and sharply anti-Calvinistic. Having ere long banished the Mass from her chapels, she declined the overtures of Pius IV., who offered such concessions as the Cup for the laity. In 1559, by an Act of Uniformity, King

[1] Kyd, *ut supra*.

Edward's last Prayer-Book was restored in a revised form marked by few changes. The Calvinistic "Black Rubric" was removed; and while, strangely enough, the Invocation on the Elements was left as in the simpler form of 1552, the words said by the priest at the Delivery of the Elements were taken from Edward's two Prayer-Books and combined in one form which still remains. The removal of dogmatic offence, together with eclectic combinations of phrases, went far to conciliate Roman Catholics, who still formed a majority of the population of the land.

In 1562, Archbishop Parker presented to Convocation a series of Forty-two Articles; and on the 29th of January 1563 thirty-nine of them were signed by the Bishops and by the Lower House about February 10th. Having been laid before the Queen in Council, and "carefully read and examined by the Queen herself," they were published by Wolf the Queen's printer. Wolf's copy omits Art. XXIX., "Of the Wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper."

It may be well to give here the main sentences of the Articles bearing on our subject. Art. XXV. "Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's goodwill towards us, by the which

he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him. There be two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord."

Art. XXVIII. "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love which Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

"Transubstantiation (or change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

"The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

Attention may be drawn to the omission of the protest against *ex operato*, and of the paragraph rejecting "the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood." Bishop Guest, the author of Art. XXVIII. declares that his intention was "not to deny the reality of the presence of the Body of Christ in the Supper, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." The dissatisfaction of the Puritans with the Articles led to their final revision in 1571. No changes of interest to us here were made.

Our sacramental references to the English Prayer-Book may be brought up to date very briefly. When the Scottish James I. ascended the united throne in 1603, the Puritan and Calvinistic party in England presented to him the Millenary Petition, craving certain changes. The result, however, of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604 was to augment rather than diminish what was objectionable to the petitioners. Laud's version for Scotland will be referred to later. From 1645 till 1662 the Prayer-Book was, of course, less influential. The Savoy Conference (1661) yielded nothing to the Puritans. At last the Convocation of 1662, acting under royal letters, brought the book to its present state without any alterations of Eucharistical interest beyond the reintroduction of the Com-

memoration of the Departed. Baxter's Liturgy never assumed importance. The Consecration Prayer which Baxter proposed to introduce is worthy of quotation.

"And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of thy infinite mercy vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy creature gifts of bread and wine, that we receiving them according to our Saviour Christ's institution, in remembrance of his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, and rendering unto thee all possible praise for the same, may by faith be made very partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits, to our spiritual nourishment, and for the glory of thy holy name."[1] Nothing came of William III.'s Commission appointed to effect a better comprehension of Dissenters.

In the Irish Episcopal Church an addition was made in 1878 to the Catechism, declaring that the body and blood of Christ are "taken and received only after a heavenly and spiritual manner." In the American revision of 1789, Bishop Seabury, who had been consecrated in Scotland, effected the adop-

[1] The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, etc., as amended by the Presbyterian Divines in the Royal Commission of 1661.

tion of the Invocation which occurs in the Scottish version.

The variations through which the Prayer-Book has passed have not effaced its Calvinistic features. While the extreme ritualist of to-day may read into the Communion Service more than the Edwardians of the sixteenth century would have admitted, the holders of the Calvinistic view (and even of a lower view) may all unaffectedly rejoice in the beautiful Communion Office of the English Church.

CHAPTER VIII

DEVELOPMENT OF THE REFORMED DOCTRINE IN SCOTLAND

IN tracing the rise of the reformed doctrine in Scotland, the beginnings of popular interest in the subject may be attributed to the evangelical influence of Wycliffe's Bible, and to the Lollard propagandism which reached the Northern Kingdom in the fifteenth century. It is one of the Lollard tenets, recorded by Knox in his History, that to adore the Sacrament is idolatry. In the same work Knox incorporates "Patrick's Places," *i.e.* certain evangelical principles written by the martyr Patrick Hamilton who perished in 1528. These "Places," though not primarily concerned with the Mass, deal with the question of saving faith in a manner fitted to impugn the Romish insistence upon the function of the Sacrament. George Wishart (who died in 1546) did not, we may feel sure, spare the superstitions of the Mass as he preached up and down the land. The progress of

the controversy on the Continent and in England must have been eagerly watched by many in Scotland. The Genevan influence communicated by Scottish refugees was strong. At length the Protestant view, established in 1560, becomes associated with the great name of Knox.

In the preparation of doctrinal and liturgical forms, assistance was given to Knox by four ministers, Row, Spottiswoode, Winram, and Douglas, the result being the Scots Confession and the First Booke of Discipline (1560). In the Confession the Eucharist is thus set forth :

"And thus we utterly condemn the vanity of those who affirm the sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs; no, we assuredly believe that by Baptism we are engrafted in Christ Jesus to be made partakers of his justice, whereby our sins are covered and remitted: and also that in the Supper rightly used Christ Jesus is so joined with us that he becomes very nourishment and food to our souls: not that we imagine any transubstantiation of bread into Christ's natural body, and of wine into his natural blood, as the Papists have perniciously taught and damnably believed; but this union and conjunction which we have with the body and blood of Christ Jesus, in the right use of the sacraments, is wrought by the

operation of the Holy Ghost, who by true faith carrieth us above all things that are visible, carnal, and earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the body and blood of Christ Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us, which is now in heaven, and appeareth in the presence of his Father for us: and yet notwithstanding the far distance of place which is between his body now glorified in heaven, and us now mortal on this earth; yet we most assuredly believe that the bread which we break is the communion of his body, and the cup which we bless is the communion of his blood. So that we confess and undoubtedly believe that the faithful, in the right use of the Lord's Table, do so eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus, that he remaineth in them and they in him; yea, they are so made flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, that as the eternal Godhead hath given to the flesh of Christ Jesus (which of its own nature was mortal and corruptible) life and immortality; so doth Christ Jesus his flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us, give unto us the same prerogatives. Which, albeit we confess are neither given unto us at this time only, neither by the proper virtue and power of the sacrament only; yet we affirm that the faithful in the right use of the Lord's Table, have such conjunction with Christ Jesus, as the natural

man cannot apprehend; yea, and further, we affirm that albeit the faithful, oppressed by negligence and manly infirmity, do not profit so much as they would, in the very instant action of the supper, yet shall it after bring fruit forth, as lively seed sown in good ground; for the Holy Spirit which can never be divided from the right institution of the Lord Jesus, will not frustrate the faithful of the fruit of that mystical action; but all these we say come of true faith which apprehendeth Christ Jesus, who only maketh his sacraments effectual unto us."

In the Booke of Discipline it is enjoined concerning the Lord's Supper, that the superstitions of the times are to be avoided, and that the ignorant are to be instructed and sharply examined. Four times a year the Sacrament should be celebrated, the time of "Pasche" having no special virtue. In 1564 appeared the first edition of the Book of Common Order, largely based upon the Book of Geneva. The section entitled "The Manner of the Administration of the Lord's Supper" embodies the Calvinistic doctrine. "Then to the end that we may be worthy partakers of His merits and most comfortable benefits, which is the true eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, let us not suffer our minds to wander about the consideration of these earthly and corruptible things (which we see present

with our eyes and feel with our hands) to seek Christ's bodily presence in them, as if He were enclosed in the bread and wine, or as if the elements were turned and changed into the substance of His flesh and blood; for the only way to dispose our souls to receive nourishment, relief, and quickening of His substance, is to lift up our minds by faith above all things worldly and sensible, and thereby to enter into heaven, that we may find and receive Christ, where He dwelleth undoubtedly very God and very Man, in the incomprehensible glory of His Father."

The Eucharistic prayer is remarkable for the absence of explicit consecration of the Elements, the nearest approach being found in the words: "At the commandment of Jesus Christ our Lord, we present ourselves to this His Table, which He hath left us to be used in remembrance of His death, until His coming again, to declare . . . that by Him alone we are possessed in our spiritual kingdom, to eat and drink at His Table, with whom we have our conversation presently in heaven, and by whom our bodies shall be raised up again from the dust."[1]

The final note to the reader declares that "we utterly renounce the error of the Papists; secondly, we restore unto the Sacrament his own substance

[1] Edition of the Church Service Society.

and to Christ His proper place. And as for the words of the Lord's Supper, we rehearse them, not because they should change the substance of the bread or wine, or that the repetition thereof, with the intent of the sacrificer, should make the Sacrament, as the Papists falsely believe, but they are read and pronounced to teach us how to behave ourselves in that action, and that Christ might witness unto our faith, as it were with His own mouth, that He hath ordained these signs to our spiritual use and comfort; we do first, therefore, examine ourselves, according to St. Paul's rule, and prepare our minds, that we may be worthy partakers of so high mysteries; then taking bread, we give thanks, break and distribute it as Christ our Saviour hath taught us; finally, the administration ended, we give thanks again according to His example, so that without His word and warrant there is nothing in this holy action attempted."

The doctrine thus expressed received abundant enforcement in Knox's public teaching and preaching as well as in his writings. His repudiation of the Romish theory implied no abatement of conviction as to the priceless value and efficacy of the Rite, which is "the declaration of our covenant that by Christ Jesus we are invested, maintained, and continued in league with God our Father." The

following passage is one of special beauty: "And to seal the same his everlasting mercy more deeply in our hearts, and to declare the same before the world, he sendeth us to the table of his dear Son, Christ Jesus our Lord, which, at the last supper in this corporal life had with his disciples, he did institute for his Kirk, and command the same to be used in remembrance of him to his coming again. To the which, when we present ourselves, as in heart, we do believe (I speak of God's chosen children), so in mouth we do confess, and before the world solemnly we protest, that we are the household of God our Father, received in the league of his mercy according to the purpose of his own good pleasure, and that we, members of the body of Christ Jesus, were clad with his righteousness and innocency. And therefore now doth he admit us to his table, and expressly in his word setteth before us the bread of life which descended from heaven, to assure our consciences that, our former defection from him notwithstanding, with joy he doth receive us, as the father did his unthankful and prodigal son, returning to him from his wretched condition and miserable poverty. This holy table, I say, hath the wisdom of God commanded to be used in his Kirk to assure the members of his body that his majesty changeth not as man doth, but that his

gifts and vocation are such as of the which he cannot repent him towards his elect."[1]

Knox's strictures on despisers of the Sacraments are severe. "Such as this day contemn the use of sacraments . . . declare themselves repugnant to the wisdom of God. . . . He putteth no term of perfection to what a man may attain in this life that he needeth not to use the sacraments for aid and help to his infirmity. . . . The punishment of such pride and arrogancy is manifest this day to the Kirk of God."[2] There was need for clear teaching and firm assertion in view of the Mass performed in Queen Mary's Chapel at Holyrood on the one hand, and of Protestant vagaries on the other.

The designs of James VI. upon the liberties of the Church caused attention to be centred more upon polity than upon doctrine. The Second Book of Discipline, or Heidis and Conclusiones of the Policie of the Kirk (1578), in which Andrew Melville had so important a share, supplies little of interest for us here. But we have a valuable contribution to devout meditation in Robert Bruce's Sermons upon the Sacrament.

When, in 1629, Charles I. brought before the Scottish bishops the question of a new liturgy, they forwarded to him a draft of the compromise which

[1] Answers to Questions on Baptism, etc. [2] *Ibid.*

(before his father's death) had been made between the English Liturgy and the Book of Common Order. From this draft, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, before the change thereof made by the Archbishop of Canterbury," the following Eucharistical prayer is taken: "Merciful Father, we beseech thee that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour, his holy institution, may be made partakers of his most blessed body and blood. Send down, O Lord, thy blessing upon this Sacrament, that it may be unto us the effectual exhibitive instrument of the Lord Jesus."

The minister exhorts: "Let us lift up our hearts unto the Lord, and by faith lay hold upon Jesus, whom God the Father by His Spirit offereth to us in this holy Sacrament, that we may draw virtue from the Lord to quicken and conserve our souls and bodies unto eternal life." The Invocation appears in the above prayer, but it is the *Sacrament* rather than the mere Elements that is the "instrument." Strangely enough, it was the prelatic party which at this time considered the Invocation unnecessary, on the ground that the words of the Institution sufficed to consecrate the Elements.

The expression "the change thereof made by the Archbishop of Canterbury" leads us to the Book of

Common Prayer "for the use of the Church of Scotland," commonly known as Laud's Prayer-Book (1637), a version of the English Book of Common Prayer containing some distinctive features, such as the reintroduction of the Invocation upon the Elements. The Scottish Communion Office, dating from 1764, is remarkable for the words occurring in the Invocation upon the bread and wine "that they may become the body and blood."

Laud's Prayer-Book having been spurned in Scotland, and the indefatigable primate himself having been sent to the Tower, an important period is reached, namely that signalised by the Confession of Faith and The Directory for the Publick Worship of God, agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster with the assistance of Commissioners from the Church of Scotland (1642–1643), approven by the Scottish General Assembly in 1647, and ratified by the Scottish Parliament in 1649. As all the world knows, these Presbyterian Standards are frankly Calvinistic, though by no means hyper-Calvinistic. The chapter on the Sacraments in general (xxvii.), like that on each of them in particular, is distinguished by a very high view of their importance and efficacy. The thinking is of the clearest, up to the limits possible in a matter, the mystical character of which is fully recognised.

The second and third sections of this chapter are keenly discriminative, pointing out the spiritual relation or sacramental union subsisting between the sign and the thing signified; explaining whence it is that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other; and emphasising the work of the Spirit and the Word of Institution as causative factors in sacramental grace.

Along with this may be taken the admirable statements in the Larger Catechism (Quest. 161 *et seq.*,), and in the Shorter Catechism (Quest. 91 *et seq.*). The Larger Catechism declares the sacraments to be effectual means of salvation, not by any power in themselves or in the administrator, but by the working of the Holy Ghost and the blessing of Christ. A sacrament not only signifies, seals, and exhibits the benefit of Christ's mediation, but also strengthens and increases faith and all other graces. The parts of a sacrament are two; the one an outward and sensible sign, the other an inward and spiritual grace. The Shorter Catechism couples faith in the recipient with the working of the Spirit, and in the definition of a sacrament adds that Christ and His benefits are not only represented and sealed, but actually applied to believers.

The Confessional chapter (xxix.) on the Supper itself describes the Rite as the Sacrament of Christ's

body and blood, to be observed in His Church unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of Himself in His death, the sealing of all benefits thereof to true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in Him, their further engagement in and to all duties which they owe to Him, and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with Him, and with each other as members of His mystical body. In the Sacrament no real sacrifice is made at all for the remission of sins of the quick or dead, but only a commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Therefore the Popish sacrifice of the Mass is "most abominably injurious to Christ's one and only Sacrifice." Transubstantiation is repugnant not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense and reason, and overthrows the nature of a sacrament. Consubstantiation is excluded; for the Body and Blood are not corporally in, with, or under the bread and wine.

Yet the outward Elements are not devoid of a relation to Christ. There is such a relation between them and Him "as that truly yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ." In substance and nature, however, they still remain truly and only bread and wine as they were before. Ministers are to declare Christ's Word

of Institution to the people, to pray and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to a holy use.

Worthy communicants do inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporeally but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified and all the benefits of His death. Ignorance or wickedness in the communicant invalidates the Sacrament for him. Unworthy communicants incur guilt and condemnation, and may not be admitted to "these holy mysteries."

The Larger Catechism (Quest. 168) asserts that worthy communicants feed upon Christ's Body and Blood to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace; have their union and communion with Him confirmed; testify and renew their thankfulness and engagement to God; and their mutual fellowship with each other as members of the same mystical body. The phraseology of the Shorter Catechism is similar.

The section on the Lord's Supper in the "Directory for the Publick Worship of God," issued by the Westminster Assembly, is inspired by the opinions just stated. Celebration is to be frequent. The inestimable benefit and great necessity of the Rite are asserted. A form is indicated for "the prayer, thanksgiving, or blessing of the bread and wine," the

minister being directed "earnestly to pray God . . . so to sanctify these elements both of bread and wine, and to bless his own ordinance, that we receive by faith the body and blood of Jesus Christ, crucified for us, and so feed upon him, that he may be one with us and we with him; that he may live in us and we in him."

We have now exhausted the documentary symbols affecting our subject, so far as Scottish Presbyterianism is concerned. The latter part of the seventeenth century was more engrossed with questions of polity and forms of worship than of theological dogma.

CHAPTER IX

FROM 1643 TO 1800

IN the preceding sketch of Eucharistical doctrine in England and Scotland we followed the fortunes of church standards and liturgies. There are, however, other aspects of opinion which call for reference. It will be convenient to strike in at the date of the Westminster Assembly.

About that time the Presbyterians were in the ascendant in England, and in 1647 the Long Parliament voted the establishment of the Presbyterian form of Church government. Throughout the country, however, some Puritans favoured a modified form of Episcopacy, while others contended for Independency; with the result that the Parliamentary establishment never became effective.

It was perhaps partly as a result of these controversies that there began to appear in the universities a compromising temper of mind, which presently took shape in the Latitudinarian school founded at Cambridge by Benjamin Whichcote,

who in 1644 became Provost of King's College, Cambridge. The troubles in the Church, on the one hand, and the new infidelity of Hobbes on the other, caused the Latitudinarians to adopt an ironical and an apologetic tone, which laid more stress upon ethics than upon doctrine. The characteristic preacher of the party was Tillotson (1630–1694), who "stood aloof from whatever might seem mystical." One consequence of such a temper is apt to be a meagre view of the Sacraments.

The same consequence commonly follows from an indifference to positive dogma, and about this time a distaste for dogmatic precision begins to appear in certain quarters. Of the "ever-memorable" John Hales of Eton, the friend of Chillingworth, who died in 1656, it is recorded that "nothing troubled him more than the brawls which were grown from religion," and that (at the Hague) "there he did bid John Calvin good-night, as he often told." There were many others who were beginning to bid good-night not only to Calvin, but also to the supernatural doctrines of Christ. The rise and spread of English Arianism, Deism, Unitarianism need not be here described. It is, however, important to notice that the rationalistic temper of these schools, with their impoverished view of the person of Christ, their aversion to any-

thing mystical, and their scepticism regarding transcendental influences, is very unfavourable to a rich or ardent conception of the Sacrament.

In the case, again, of the Friends, their disparagement of the Sacraments has been rather due to an excessive supernaturalism. The inwardness which they conceive as belonging to a religion enjoyed under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit implies a superiority to all external forms, the Lord's Supper included. The Communion does not consist "in any symbolic breaking of bread and drinking of wine, but in that daily communion with Christ through the Holy Spirit, and through the obedience of faith, by which the believer is nourished."[1] The dying Redeemer's words "it is finished" imply a total abolition of rites, the Holy Ghost alone being sufficient for all illumination and sustainment. The true Lord's Supper is indicated in the words: "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in unto him, and will sup with him, and he with Me."

The latter half of the seventeenth century was not, however, entirely given over to this crude naturalism on the one hand, and this excess of spiritualism on the other. A worthier view is represented by the two great names of the Royalist Jeremy

[1] Chambers's *Encyclopædia*, art. on "Society of Friends."

Taylor (1613–1667) and the Puritan John Owen (1616–1683).

Taylor's *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation*, was published in 1654, and his less controversial work, *The Worthy Communicant*, in 1660. While Transubstantiation is rejected, a real though Sacramental Presence of Christ is asserted. "In the explication of this question it is much insisted upon that it be required whether, when we say we believe Christ's body to be really in the sacrament, we mean that body, that flesh that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, dead, and buried. I answer, I know none else that He had or hath: there is but one body of Christ natural and glorified; but he that says that body is glorified that was crucified, says that it is the same body, but not after the same manner; and so it is in the sacrament, we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ that was broken and poured forth: for there is no other body, no other blood of Christ; but though it is the same which we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner."[1]

The question then is, what does Taylor mean by "another manner"? He means something which excludes any materialistic view. If the above

[1] "The Worthy Communicant."

passage seems to any to exceed in literalism, the following expressions are sufficiently discriminating. The Sacrament is truly called the body of Christ, because there is joined with it the "vital power, virtue, and efficacy of that body." To a large extent the question is with Taylor a matter of expression. The "bread of life," "body of Christ," "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," are "nothing else but mysterious and sacramental expressions of His great excellency—that whosoever [communicates worthily] shall partake of all the benefits of the Cross of Christ, where His body was broken, and His blood poured forth for the remission of our sins and the salvation of the world."[1] And Taylor quite parts company with literalism when he adduces the illustration that Elias is said to be already come, because John had *the power* of Elias. Similarly, he speaks of receiving Christ's body and blood *out of* the sacrament (by simple faith), much more *in it*. This is an assertion of Real Presence which is equally applicable to faith apart from any Sacrament at all. The fact is that the golden-mouthed Jeremy was less interested in the subject metaphysically than devoutly. It is essential only that faith should accept "what is revealed plainly and taught usefully." The devotional and practical

[1] "The Worthy Communicant."

value of the great divine's writings upon the Sacrament is of the highest, and will call for reference in that connection.

The Calvinism of the masterly Owen is no mere echo, and his doctrine of the Eucharist, so clearly stated in his beautiful Sacramental Discourses, preached from 1669–1682, is full of force and freshness. The main uses of the Rite are commemoration, representation, obsignation, exhibition, participation, profession, incorporation, nourishment. Corporeal communion is rejected, and the function of faith magnified, especially as "acting on" Christ's death. A rich view of the Atonement informs the Sacrament with inexhaustible meaning.

The Supper has therefore a unique and sublime value. "There is a peculiar communion with Christ in this ordinance which we have in no other ordinance. . . . This is the faith of the whole church, and has been so in all ages. This is the greatest mystery of all the *practicals* of our Christian religion—a way of receiving Christ by *eating and drinking*,—something peculiar, that is not in prayer, that is not in the hearing of the word, nor in any other part of divine worship whatsoever,—a peculiar participation of Christ, a peculiar acting of faith toward Christ. This participation is not carnal but spiritual. . . . 'It is a spiritual communication,'

saith he, 'of myself unto you; but it is as intimate, and gives as real an incorporation, as if you did eat my flesh and drink my blood.' The church, forsaking this rule of a spiritual interpretation, ruined itself, and set up a monster instead of this blessed mysterious ordinance."[1] "It is a great mystery, and great wisdom and exercise of faith lie in it, how to obtain a participation of Christ. When the world had lost an understanding of this mystery, for want of spiritual insight, they conceived a means to make it up, that it should be *easy* on the part of them that did partake, and very *prodigious* on the part of them that did adminster. The priest, with a few words, turned the bread into the body of Christ; and the people have no more to do but to put it into their mouths, and so Christ is partaken of. It was the loss of the mystery of faith in the real participation of Christ that put them on that invention."[2]

But the ordinance is no mere "naked figure." "Christ is present with us by way of *exhibition;* that is, he doth really tender and exhibit himself unto the souls of believers in this ordinance. They (the symbols) exhibit that which they do not contain. . . . Certainly we believe that our Lord Jesus Christ doth not invite us unto this table for

[1] Disc. x. [2] Disc. vii.

the *bread that perishes*, for outward food: it is to feed our souls. What do we think, then? Doth he invite us unto an empty painted feast? do we deal so with our friends? Here is something really exhibited by Jesus Christ unto us to receive, besides the outward pledges of bread and wine. We must not think the Lord Jesus Christ deludes our souls with empty shows and appearances. That which is exhibited is himself; it is 'his flesh as meat indeed, and his blood as drink indeed'; it is himself as broken and crucified that he exhibits unto us. And it is the fault and sin of every one of us if we do not receive him *this day*, when an exhibition and tender is made unto us, as here, by way of food."[1]

Owen's terms "exhibits" and "exhibition" might lead us to suppose that he conceived the Sacrament mainly as a pictorial illustration, an acted parable. But his use of these terms implies the presence and operation of something much more substantial and vital than belongs to a mere "counterfeit presentment." This will now appear. "We receive our food that it may *incorporate* and turn into blood and spirits,—that it may become one with us. . . . Christ doth exhibit himself . . . to be received into union, and to give strength unto our souls.[2] . . .

[1] Disc. x. [2] Disc. x.

There is a grant or real communication of Jesus Christ unto the souls of them that do believe. . . . Can you eat and drink unless something be really communicated? You are called to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man; unless *really communicated*, we cannot eat it nor drink it. . . . As truly, my brethren, as we do eat of this bread and do drink of this cup, which is really communicated to us, so every true believer doth receive Christ, his body and blood, in all the benefits of it, that are really exhibited by God unto the soul in his ordinance."[1]

Further light is cast on Owen's view by his Calvinistic interpretation of the location of Christ's body. His body proper is not in the Sacrament but in Heaven. "It is not a *corporeal* presence; there are innumerable arguments against *that*. Everything that is in sense, reason, and faith of a man overthrows that corporeal presence. 'Nevertheless,' saith our Saviour, 'it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you.' The corporeal presence of Christ, and the evangelical presence of the Holy Ghost as the Comforter, in the New Testament, are inconsistent. 'I must go away, or the Comforter will not come.' But he *so* went away as to his

[1] Disc. xxiii.

presence as to come again with his bodily presence as often as the priests call! No; saith Peter, Acts iii. 21, 'The heaven must receive him.' For how long? 'Till the time of the restitution of all things.' 'I go away as to my bodily presence, or the Comforter will not come.' And when he is gone away, the heaven must receive him until the time of the restitution of all things. We must not therefore look after *such* a presence."[1]

The Presence is *sacramental:* Christ "under the outward symbols of bread and wine, by his institution making such a sacramental union between the thing signified and the sign, that the signs remaining to be what they are in themselves, they are unto us the thing that is signified, by virtue of the sacramental union that Christ hath appointed between his body and blood and the benefits of it. And the bread and wine, though not changed at all in themselves, yet they become to us by faith not what they are in themselves, but what is signified by them—the body and blood of Christ."[2] Here is "a mysterious reception of him in them, really as to come to a real substantial incorporation in our souls."

Thus, so far as the metaphysics of the subject go, we perceive a resemblance between the subtle

[1] Disc. x. [2] Disc. xxv.

Romish theory of "substance" in the elements, and Owen's theory of "substantial incorporation."

The eighteenth century, notorious for coldness and poverty of religion, supplies little of interest for our present study. The illustrious names of Wesley and Whitefield belong more to the history of evangelism than theology. Wesley, it may be remarked, had such a sense of the Church as the custodian of Sacraments, that he felt a reluctance in sanctioning the celebration of the Lord's Supper amongst the Methodist community. Indeed, about the time of 1735 he was a High Churchman, refusing Holy Communion to all who were not episcopally baptized, holding Communion weekly, and insisting on fasting and confession prior to communicating. Of course, his High Churchism gave way before the immediacy of his convictions and the necessities of the Methodist organisation. It was Wesley who revived the Love-feast, held (for Church members only) in each society once a quarter. The proceedings consist mainly of praise, prayer, personal testimony, followed by the Lord's Supper.

The famous theologians of the eighteenth century, Butler and Paley, were too busy over their apologetic arguments against the scepticism fostered by Rousseau, Voltaire, and Hume, to give much

attention to sacramental ideas. The good Dr. Samuel Johnson was not lacking in a devout conception of the Eucharist, as may be gathered from his prayers composed in preparation for Communion.

In Scotland the age of Moderatism was singularly barren of theological fruits. Thomas Boston (1676–1732) found himself compelled to labour at the first principles of the doctrine of grace. His *Human Nature in its Fourfold State* is surprisingly deficient in sacramental teaching. But the following extract indicates his attitude:

"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is in a special manner appointed for these ends. It is not only a solemn public profession, and a seal of our union and communion with Christ; but it is a means of most intimate communion with him, and strengthens our union with him, our faith, love, repentance, and other graces. . . . Give yourselves unto prayer; open your mouths wide, and he will fill them. By these means the branches in Christ may be further nourished, grow up and bring forth much fruit."[1]

One theologian of this period there is whose contributions are valuable, although his name carries us across the Atlantic. About 1746, Jonathan Edwards penned his "sheets," entitled "An Humble

[1] *Fourfold State:* "The State of Grace," pt. ii.

Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God concerning the Qualifications requisite to a Complete Standing and Full Communion in the Visible Christian Church."

The genius of Edwards fitted him to deal in the most penetrating manner with controversial questions connected with the Lord's Supper. Such sacramental questions, however, as he does discuss are for the most part concerned with soteriology and personal religion. From section ix. we take a passage notable both for its spiritual beauty and for its indication of the general way in which the author conceived of the Supper:

"There is in the Lord's Supper a mutual solemn profession of the two parties transacting the covenant of grace, and visibly united in that covenant; the Lord Christ by his minister, on the one hand, and the communicants (who are professing believers) on the other. The administrator of the ordinance acts in the quality of Christ's minister, acts in his name, as representing him; and stands in the place where Christ himself stood at the first administration of this Sacrament, and in the original institution of this ordinance. Christ, by the speeches and actions of the minister, makes a solemn profession of his part in the covenant of grace: he exhibits the sacrifice of his body broken and his blood shed; and in the

minister's offering the sacramental bread and wine to the communicants, Christ presents himself to the believing communicants as their propitiation and bread of life; and by these outward signs confirms and seals his sincere engagements to be their Saviour and food, and to impart to them all the benefits of his propitiation and salvation. And they in receiving what is offered, and eating and drinking the symbols of Christ's body and blood, also profess their part in the covenant of grace; they profess to embrace the promises and to lay hold of the hope set before them, to receive the atonement, to receive Christ as their spiritual food, and to feed upon him in their hearts by faith. Indeed, what is professed on both sides is the *heart;* for Christ in offering himself professes the willingness of *his heart* to be theirs who duly receive him; all the communicants, on their part, profess the willingness of *their hearts* to receive him, which they declare by their significant actions. . . . Thus the Lord's Supper is plainly a *mutual* renovation, confirmation, and seal of the covenant of grace: both the covenanting parties profess their consent to their respective parts in the covenant of grace. . . . And there is in this ordinance the very same thing acted over in profession and sensible signs, which is spiritually transacted between Christ and his spouse in the covenant that unites them. . . .

The *actions* of the communicants at the Lord's table have as expressive and significant a language as the most solemn words. When a person in this ordinance *takes* and *eats* and *drinks* those things which represent Christ, the plain meaning and implicit profession of these his actions is this, 'I take this crucified Jesus as my Saviour, my sweetest food, my chief portion, and the life of my soul, consenting to acquiesce in him as such, and to hunger and thirst after him only, renouncing all other Saviours and all other portions for his sake.'"[1]

A certain Rev. Solomon Williams wrote a book controverting Edwards' views as to qualifications necessary for Communion. Edwards retorted at some length. Their differences of opinion do not concern us directly here. But we may extract a passage touching on the *res sacramenti*:

"What *inward* thing does the outward taking or accepting the body and blood of Christ represent, but the *inward* accepting Christ's body and blood, or an accepting him in the heart? And what *spiritual* thing is the outward feeding on Christ in this ordinance the sign of, but a *spiritual* feeding on Christ, or the soul's feeding on him? Now there is no other way of the soul's feeding on him but by

[1] *On Humble Inquiry*, section ix.

that *faith* by which Christ becomes our spiritual food, and the refreshment and vital nourishment of our souls."[1] Like Owen, Edwards is never weary of lauding the potency of faith in connection with the Sacrament.

[1] *Answer to Solomon Williams.*

CHAPTER X

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE opening of the nineteenth century is marked by a strong reaction from the spirit of the eighteenth,—a reaction evidenced alike in philosophy, general literature, and religious thought. Kant led the way to a more spiritual philosophy, and inaugurated the German school to which S. T. Coleridge and others in this country were so much indebted. Wordsworth left behind him the polite school of poetry, and infused a new religious mysticism into the feeling for nature. Such a temper is more favourable to sacramental ideas than the prosaic temper of the previous age.

In his *Aids to Reflection* (1825), Coleridge, by a bold advance beyond the standpoint of Paley, vindicated the value of intuition with regard to the suprasensible. The presence of mystery in all things is no longer resented; and the profounder mind of Coleridge stands in contemplative awe before the mystery of Christ's atonement.

In his Notes on the Book of Common Prayer he makes such references to the Eucharist as these: "The best preparation for taking this sacrament . . . is to read over and over again, and often on your knees,—at all events with a kneeling and praying heart,—the Gospel according to St. John, till your mind is familiarised to the contemplation of Christ, the Redeemer and Mediator of mankind. . . . After this course of study, you may then take up and peruse sentence by sentence the Communion Service, the best of all comments on the Scriptures appertaining to this mystery. And this is the preparation which will prove, with God's grace, the surest preventative of, or antidote against, the freezing poison, the lethargising hemlock of the doctrine of the Sacramentaries, according to whom the Eucharist is a mere practical metaphor, in which things are employed instead of articulated sounds, for the exclusive purpose of recalling to our minds the historical facts of our Lord's crucifixion; in short (the profaneness is with them, not with me), just the same as when Protestants drink a glass of wine to the glorious memory of William III.! True it is that the remembrance is one end of the sacrament; but it is, Do this in remembrance of me,—of all that Christ was and is, and hath done and is still doing for fallen mankind, and, of course, of His crucifixion

inclusively, but not of his crucifixion alone. 14th December 1827."

In the first Exhortation of the Communion Service, the Sacrament is said to be "received in remembrance of his meritorious Cross and Passion." Coleridge proposed to insert "in remembrance of his assumption of humanity, his incarnation, and meritorious Cross and Passion." Likewise, where God is said to have given His Son "to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament," Coleridge would insert "*as* in that holy Sacrament." "For not in that Sacrament exclusively, but in all the acts of assimilative faith, of which the Eucharist is a solemn, eminent, and representative instance, an instance and the symbol, Christ is our spiritual food and sustenance."

Commenting on the Rubric in the Communion of the Sick, which declares that a man who is prevented through any reasonable cause from communicating sacramentally, may yet by faith "eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth," Coleridge remarks thus:—"I think this rubric, in what I conceive to be its true meaning, a precious doctrine, as fully acquitting our Church of all Romish superstition, respecting the nature of the

Eucharist, in relation to the whole scheme of man's redemption. But the latter part of it—"he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth"—seems to me very incautiously expressed, and scarcely to be reconciled with the Church's own definition of a sacrament in general. For in such a case, where is "the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace given"?

Coleridge's friends, the Lake Poets, were (in the ordinary sense) less theological than himself, and took less interest in points of Christian doctrine; but Wordsworth's spiritual interpretation of nature quickened religious feeling as contrasted with that of mere practical morality. To the high priest of nature the whole created universe is essentially spiritual and sacramental. Communion with nature induces "sensations sweet, felt in the blood, and felt along the heart." The mood described in "Tintern Abbey" has much in common with the rapture of a St. Paul, caught up into paradise and hearing unspeakable words, whether in the body or out of the body he cannot tell:

> "that serene and blessed mood,
> In which the affections gently lead us on,—
> Until, the breath of this corporeal frame
> And even the motion of our human blood

> Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
> In body, and become a living soul:
> While with an eye made quiet by the power
> Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
> We see into the life of things."

The sense sublime of something deeply interfused with nature and with the mind of man, the sense of a motion and a spirit impelling all thinking things, all objects of all thoughts, and rolling through all things,—such a sense is in close affinity with that sacramental sense of the Holy Spirit as interfused with the visible body, the Church, and as informing such an object of thought as the Holy Communion.

The influence of the romantic school of Sir Walter Scott was of a different order. "I do not think," remarks Mr. R. H. Hutton, "that there is a single study in all his romances of what may be fairly called a pre-eminently spiritual character as such"[1]; yet the antique, conservative, and æsthetic elements in Scott took effect upon many minds. Attractive aspects of the ancient Church are depicted in the Waverley series. Scott helped to make Ruskin a Tory, and exercised a similar influence upon Oxford generally, and Newman in particular. Although the "growing liberalism," against which the Tractarians set themselves, was more an intellectual than a political spirit,

[1] *Scott*, "English Men of Letters," p. 126.

yet the two things are often closely connected. Feudalism and hierarchy have points in common. The æsthetic movement carried on by Ruskin took in ecclesiastical circles the form of a beautification of churches and an enrichment of ritual.

But the cardinal fact in the new religious spirit was the evangelical revival. For, however little store may be set by a primary evangelicism upon sacramental grace, there can be no belief in such grace without belief in the evangelical doctrines, such as those of the incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection, the ascension, the intercession, and the Holy Spirit. Let those doctrines be accepted as supernatural facts, and the next natural step is to inquire how they are witnessed to and made effectual by the means of grace. The earnest positive faith of the Olney school (Newton, Thomas Scott, and Cowper)[1] laid the foundation for another whose zeal and earnestness were not less.

The Oxford Tractarian Movement is of the utmost interest in connection with our subject. The first though not the greatest name to be mentioned is that of John Keble (1792–1866), whose work, *The Christian Year; or, Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holy Days throughout the Year*, was published in 1827. The collection

[1] Scott died in 1821.

breathes a spirit of devout aspiration after an intenser communion with the Church's divine Head. In the poem on Holy Communion these verses occur:

"O God of mercy, God of might,
How should pale sinners bear the sight,
If, as Thy power is surely here,
Thine open glory should appear?

For now Thy people are allowed
To scale the mount and pierce the cloud,
And Faith may feed her eager view
With wonders Sinai never knew.

Fresh from the atoning sacrifice
The world's Creator bleeding lies;
That man, His foe by whom He bled,
May take Him for his daily bread.

Sweet awful hour! the only sound
One gentle footstep gliding round,
Offering by turns on Jesus' part
The Cross to every hand and heart."

While still a curate near Oxford, Keble gathered round him a band of disciples, amongst whom were Hurrell Froude and John Henry Newman, devoted to the revival of what they thought to be the primitive ideal of the Church as the organ of grace. Here was the germ of the Tractarian Movement.

In the *Christian Year*, says Newman, "when the general tone of religious literature was so nerveless

and impotent as it was at that time, Keble struck an original note, and woke up in the hearts of thousands a new music, the music of a school long unknown in England." One of the main intellectual truths which it brought home to Newman "was what may be called, in a large sense of the word, the Sacramental system; that is, the doctrine that material phenomena are both the types and instruments of real things unseen, — a doctrine which embraces in its fulness not only what Anglicans as well as Catholics believe about Sacraments properly so called; but also the article of the 'Communion of Saints,' and likewise the mysteries of the faith."[1]

Hurrell Froude, a pupil of Keble's, formed by him and in turn reacting upon him, exercised a strong influence upon Newman also. "He had a deep devotion to the Real Presence, in which he had a firm faith. He was powerfully drawn to the Mediæval Church, but not to the Primitive.[2] . . . He led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence."[3]

About 1830, Newman set to work upon his history, *The Arians of the Fourth Century.* Of the early Fathers, whose writings he was studying, he says: "Some portions of their teaching, magnificent in themselves, came like music to my inward ear, as if the response to ideas which, with little external to

[1] *Apologia*, p. 18. [2] *Ibid.* p. 24. [3] *Ibid.* p. 25.

encourage them, I had cherished so long. These were based on the mystical or sacramental principle, and spoke of the various economics or dispensations of the Eternal. I understood these passages to mean that the exterior world, physical and historical, was but the manifestation to our senses of realities greater than itself."[1]

In December 1832, Newman set out along with Hurrell Froude for the south of Europe. At Rome they began the *Lyra Apostolica*.

On the 9th of July, Newman arrived home from the Continent. "The following Sunday, 14th July, Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University pulpit. It was published under the title of 'National Apostasy.' I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833." "In and from Keble the mental activity of Oxford took that contrary direction [contrary to liberalism] which issued in what was called Tractarianism."

With the various filaments of the Tractarian warp and woof we need not here concern ourselves. Attention, however, must be paid to the strong Sacramental fibre; and it would be interesting to trace this through Newman's Anglican sermons and writings. For example, in preaching on the

[1] *Apologia*, pp. 26, 27.

mysterious in religious truth, Newman observes: —"We will not neglect it, because we do not understand it. We will hold it as a mystery, or (what was anciently called) a truth Sacramental; that is, a high invisible grace lodged in an outward form, a precious possession to be piously and thankfully guarded for the sake of the heavenly reality contained in it. Thus much we see in it, the pledge of a doctrine which reason cannot understand."[1]

In 1833, Newman and Keble were joined by Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, who in his contributions to the *Tracts for the Times* dealt with the Holy Eucharist in the spirit of the rising party. The year 1841 saw the publication and also the condemnation of the famous Tract 90, in which Newman tried to reconcile his positions with the Thirty-nine Articles. The intention of the Articles, he maintained, was to repudiate the Papal supremacy and to correct popular abuses of Catholic practice, but at the same time to leave room for what (in a stricter sense) might be described as Catholic doctrine. Nor can it be disputed that Newman has some historical ground for this contention, as in fact we have seen in our observation of Queen Elizabeth's attempts to conciliate the Romanists. In 1843 a sermon by Pusey on the

[1] *Sermon on Mysteries in Religion.*

Holy Eucharist, preached before the University, resulted in his suspension for three years from the office of preaching. Such actions on the part of those in authority drove Newman still farther in the direction of Rome. In 1845 he was received into that Church, whose tenet of Transubstantiation he found no difficulty in accepting.

In viewing the development of Newman's Eucharistic opinions, it would, of course, be quite unwarrantable to conclude that his final *mauvais pas* was the inevitable consequence of his desire for a richer conception of the Sacrament than he had found either in the evangelicism of his youth or the broad-churchism of Arnold and Whately. There was a middle resting-place: the *via media* was not a chimera. Although it did not continue to satisfy him, it continued to satisfy others, such as Keble and Pusey. What took Newman to Rome was not the logical conpulsion of his sacramental opinions, but the fascination exercised upon his whole nature by the genius of the mediæval Church. And if as a Roman Catholic he frankly accepted Transubstantiation, yet his method of holding that doctrine was far removed from the gross superstition of the uninstructed worshipper of the Host. To John Owen's conception, betraying a certain affinity with philosophic Transubstantiation, we may find a parallel in the

statement of his view made by Newman in an interesting correspondence with Dr. Alexander Whyte.[1]

Pusey continued to maintain a doctrine of the Real Presence which he deemed compatible with the Anglican standards, and yet to some extent differentiated from Transubstantiation. In his *Doctrine of the Real Presence* (1855 and 1857) he drew distinctions between Catholic and Roman Catholic theory and practice, although he sometimes remarked that it was "probably a dispute about words."

Other Anglicans there were, contemporary with Pusey, who, while less Roman in sympathy than he, cherished a high view of the Eucharist. In 1853, Wilberforce, Archdeacon of the East Riding, published his work, *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*,[2] in which he seeks to prove "that Christ's presence in the Holy Eucharist is a real presence; that the blessings of the new life are truly bestowed in it through communion with the New Adam; that consecration is a real act, whereby the inward part or thing signified is joined to the outward and visible sign; and that the Eucharistic oblation is a real sacrifice." If the author of this work shows some acquaintance with papistic writings, he betrays his feeble grasp of Calvinistic and Reformed doctrine.

[1] Whyte's *Newman*, p. 249 ff. [2] London: Mozley, 1853.

A closer reasoner makes his appearance in the author of *The One Offering*,[1] a treatise intended to vindicate the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist. In what sense is the Eucharist a sacrifice? Not because we offer Christ to be slain again, not because we can slay Christ again, nor because there is any repetition of Christ's death, but because there is a sacrificial presentation of that death. "The Eucharist is a Sacrifice, inasmuch as it is the means of presenting, and enabling us to partake of, the One Mactation on the Cross."[2] While there is much that is true, devout, and learned in this interesting volume, the distinction between *offering* and *commemorating* a sacrifice is overlooked.

Coming now to the present moment, and looking round for a worthy representative of current Anglicanism, we naturally turn to Bishop Gore, in whom we have so scholarly and spiritual-minded a theologian. In his valuable work, *The Body of Christ*,[3] we have a most candid and thoughtful inquiry into our subject. Starting with Goethe's

[1] *The One Offering:* a treatise on the Sacrificial Nature of the Eucharist, by the Rev. M. F. Sadler. London: Bell & Sons, 1889.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 73.

[3] *The Body of Christ:* an Inquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of the Holy Communion, by Charles Gore, M.A., D.D., of the Community of the Resurrection, Canon of Westminster. London: Murray, 1901.

idea of a sacrament as a "partaking of heavenly under the form of earthly nourishment," Gore premises that we cannot be satisfied with any theory which makes the Eucharist a mere metaphor for believing in Christ or receiving His words. The flesh and blood of Christ mean a gift which faith receives but does not create. It is a point of agreement amongst the Reformers that there is in the Sacrament an actual and substantial communication to us of Christ's body and blood, His life and self to be our spiritual food. The sacramental principle, that a spiritual gift should be communicated by God to man through the medium of a material ceremony, is in accordance with a true philosophy of the relations possible between spirit and matter. The main questions, then, to be answered are these: What is meant by the Body and Blood of Christ in connection with the Sacrament? How is Christ spiritually present? What is done in the eating and drinking? What is necessary on the part of the communicant? In what sense is the Eucharist a sacrifice?

The Sacramental Body of Christ is His glorified Body only not now in its material particles, but in its spiritual power and virtue. The Flesh of Christ is not a flesh of material constituents, but the spiritual principle of His glorified manhood. The

Blood of Christ is equivalent to the human life of Jesus in His glory. The union of the supernatural life of Christ with the natural elements is not hypostatical. Transubstantiation is both unscriptural and unpatristic. The Presence of Christ in the Sacrament is spiritual; and a spiritual presence is one in which the Holy Spirit, or generally spiritual purpose, effectively manifests itself, and which it effectively controls. In the eating and drinking, therefore, that which the communicant partakes of is the spiritual energy of the glorified Lord. It requires faith not only to appreciate, but to entertain and receive it. As to the sacrificial character of the Rite, the Church "can but make the appointed remembrance of Christ's passion and death and resurrection, and of His second coming which she awaits, and offer to the Father the appointed symbols, praying Him by the consecrating power of the Holy Ghost to fill the sacrifice with a divine power by accepting the earthly elements at the heavenly altar." There is no repetition of the sacrifice upon the Cross. The sacrificial offerings of worship, of gifts, of self, lend to the communion a sacrificial value of their own.

Although Dr. Gore's language and tone may occasionally seem to approximate to that of Roman writers, it would be difficult to point to any

unreasoned or superstitious elements in his view.

For the sake of completeness, it may be well to include here some reference to the prevalence in the Church of England of certain forms of Romish opinion. Some of these are crass and childish enough; others, perhaps, more deserving of respect. Both ignorance and erudition have doubtless their representatives in the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, founded about 1862. At a meeting of this society, held at Salisbury in 1889, one representative urged, in a paper afterwards published, that the time had come when they must recognise the identity of their own teaching "with that which is expressed in the Tridentine canons by Transubstantiation."[1]

The English Church Union, with its learned and zealous president, Lord Halifax, has figured more in connection with ritual than with doctrine. Tenacious doctrinal convictions, however, are characteristic of its most active members, whose conception of the Sacrament differs little from that of Rome herself.

Turning now to the Church of Scotland in the beginning of the nineteenth century, we find that the evangelical revival was at once a cause and an effect of a more positively doctrinal religion than that

[1] *The Doctrine of the Real Presence*, by Rev. E. W. Urquhart.

which had been recently in the ascendant. The "cold morality" of Moderatism gave place to a new proclamation of the doctrines of the Atonement and the Holy Spirit. The new fervour made itself felt at Communion seasons, when evangelical divines were often heard at their best. In an "action" sermon delivered by Thomas Chalmers in St. John's Church, Glasgow, prior to 1823,[1] we find the following passage: "'Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood,' says the Saviour, 'shall never die.' When you sit down at his table, you eat the bread and you drink the wine by which these are represented; and if this be done worthily, if there be a right correspondence between the hand and the heart in sacramental service, then by faith do you receive the benefits of the shed blood and the broken body; and your so doing will, as surely as any succession takes place in the instituted courses of Nature, be followed up by your blessed immortality. . . . In partaking of these, his consecrated elements, you become partakers of his gentleness and devotion and unwearied beneficence; and because like him in time, you will live with him through eternity."

The famous Edward Irving is very rich in sacra-

[1] Sermon preached in St. John's Church, Glasgow, by Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Glasgow, 1823.

mental teaching. From his *Homilies* we take the following: "That anything is at any time to be consubstantiated with the body of Christ, as poor obstinate Luther, to punish his obstinacy, was permitted to hold with fierce contention against the Reformed Churches, is an idea for which there is no foundation anywhere. We, indeed, who believe and receive this pledge of the Supper in true faith, shall be consubstantiated with Christ; but that taketh not place through the conjunction of any other substance with His glorious substance, but through the changing of the substance of fallen manhood into the new state of the risen manhood, by the same change in the day of our resurrection which passed upon Christ in the day of His resurrection. . . . To the eye of faith, and to the handling of faith, and to the receiving of faith there is indeed that present transubstantiation of which they ignorantly and foolishly say that it is made unto the sense. Faith doth indeed behold, and handle, and eat, and feed upon the risen body of Christ, although invisible to the sense, and incomprehensible to the understanding of sense, and we believe that Christ is truly and really present in the holy sacrament unto every believer, and is there and then partaken of in a high and spiritual sense, with which sight and reason have nothing to do, but

which is accomplished wholly by the Spirit through faith."

The Rev. R. Murray M'Cheyne of Dundee wrote a tract, "*This Do in remembrance of Me.*"[1] "Eating and drinking in this ordinance," he says, "imply feeding upon Christ. It is said of bread that it 'strengtheneth man's heart,' and of wine that it 'maketh glad the heart of man.' Bread is the staff of life, and wine is very reviving to those who, like Timothy, have often infirmities. They are the greatest nutritive blessings which man possesses. To feed on them in the Lord's Supper is as much as to say, I do feed on Jesus as my only strength: 'in the Lord have I righteousness and strength.' To take the bread into the hand is saying by signs, 'He is made unto me righteousness.' To feed upon it is saying, 'He is made unto me sanctification.'"

The conflict between Church and State in Scotland, resulting in the Disruption of 1843, caused men's minds to be so much engrossed with ecclesiastical controversy as to have little room for anything else. In 1843, while Pusey's suspension for his Eucharistic views was the sole topic of Oxford, the vindication of Christ's headship over His Church was being accomplished in Edinburgh. During the past half-century the chief contributions to theology have

[1] *Memoirs and Remains*, by the Rev. A. Bonar. 1844.

come from the Free Church of Scotland. But the uprise of Darwinism, and of the German critical movement under Strauss and Baur, turned the attention of theologians to apologetic and critical problems. The simple but fervent evangelicism which took its complexion from that of D. C. Moody, whose great mission was carried on about 1873, laid infinitely more stress upon the necessity of individual conversion than on the preciousness of sacramental grace. At the present moment the time is theologically ripe in the Scottish Presbyterian Churches for vigorous sacramental teaching, in accordance with their standards.

Of late an awakened interest in the reverent and orderly conduct of public worship has included a greater attention to the fitting celebration of the Lord's Supper. This movement may be observed in the Church of Scotland, with its Church Service Society, its Scottish Church Society, its *Euchologion*, and other publications; and in the United Free Church of Scotland, with its Public Worship Association and New Directory for Public Worship.

But what seems of much more importance in this direction is the present revival of dogma. The time is favourable for a development of neo-dogma. The relations of theology and natural

science having been clarified, the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures having been placed on a footing really more spiritual and secure than that of a mechanical verbal theory, there is a widespread readiness to welcome a restatement of the doctrinal contents of the Christian religion. We have seen historically that a thoroughgoing belief in the doctrines of the Christian creed tends to a corresponding appreciation of sacramental truth.

Our historical sketch may be brought to a close with a word upon the attitude of Roman Catholic thought at the present time. Modern philosophies of the relations between matter and spirit have not failed to exercise some influence upon Roman opinion. Attempts have been made to improve upon the earlier grossness attaching to a materialistic view of Transubstantiation. Whereas formerly the substances of the bread and wine were said to be changed into the substances of the Body and Blood of Christ, the accidents remaining; a more *substantial* character is now attributed to the accidents. This amounts to a virtual abandonment of the old attempt to distinguish between substance and accident. The accidents being formerly considered to be unsubstantial veils, the mind had no interest in asking what became of them in the process of

digestion and corruption. Such a question, however, inevitably suggests itself to the more scientific mind of to-day. This difficulty is now met by the explanation that at a certain stage after the reception of the elements, "the supernatural substances are withdrawn and the natural substances (of bread and wine in the process of digestion or corruption) are restored, and the accidents have again 'a subject to inhere in.'"[1] Dr. Gore is surely right in condemning this expedient as failing to obviate materialistic and unspiritualising results. For, of course, the further query arises, at what stage after reception does Christ withdraw Himself from the elements? After a quarter of an hour, it is suggested. But this comes perilously near to a *reductio ad absurdum.*

Again, there is an important particular in which later Roman theology derogates from the Sacrifice of Calvary even more than mediæval opinion. Each Mass, it is now held, involves an actual resacrificing of the victim. The syllogism would run thus: The Mass is a sacrifice; a proper sacrifice requires the destruction of the object sacrificed: therefore in the Mass Christ is sacrificed. In submitting Himself to be broken and bled in each Mass, He submits Himself to be repeatedly crucified. To this we might reply, first, that there is here some reasoning in a circle;

[1] *Roman Treatise*, quoted by Dr. Gore.

and, secondly, that such a view connects the Rite too exclusively with Calvary as compared with Christ's presence in Heaven for us. Christ having died, dieth no more, but now ever liveth to make intercession for us.

CHAPTER XI

CONSTRUCTIVE RESTATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

CHRISTIANITY has now been in existence for nearly two thousand years, and during that period Eucharistic controversy has rarely slept. From one point of view it might seem enough to make angels weep, and the enemy blaspheme, that the Sacred Rite, which is the emblem of unity and the symbol of tenderest love, should have been the centre of so much theological odium and lamentable schism. But, of course, from another point of view all this strife is an eloquent witness to the supreme importance and undying interest belonging to a thing round which so much spiritual passion and speculative energy have eddied. The wealth of ideas, the multiplicity of aspects, the far-reaching implications, the endless bearings of this Sacrament, furnish an impressive proof of its divine origin and worth. It is, indeed, without parallel—so simple in its institution, so complex in its significance and

potency! A verse or two of Scripture suffices for its prescription: the libraries of Christendom, the religious life of innumerable generations, fail to exhaust its meaning and power.

To continue, therefore, the discussion of the subject might seem to be a work of supererogation—"adding the sum of more to that which hath too much." Not seldom we may wish, with Hooker,[1] "that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have in this sacrament, and less to dispute the manner how." Truly there have been many who "because they enjoyed not, disputed"; and happily still more who "disputed not because they enjoyed"; and (we might add) multitudes who because they disputed not, enjoyed. After Herculean labours so repeatedly expended upon the matter, it is almost futile to dream of saying anything essentially new.

Yet each succeeding generation, with its various schools of thought and its individual types of mind, will continue to conceive of sacramental doctrine in its own way; and even though history may seem only to repeat itself in this or that shade of thought or feeling, there will always be something distinctive in the tone and temper of one period and another.

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* v. xlvii.

In our own day the trends of thought and feeling bearing upon religious sacraments are very mixed in character. In some quarters a merely ethical Christianity, or a thin individualistic evangelicism, or a dry intellectual temper prone to minimise the mysterious, or a prosaic disposition unable to enter into the poetry of anything symbolical, is inimical to a hearty appreciation of the sacramental in religion. But in other quarters a new appetite for doctrinal Christianity, a quickened desire after the unity of Christ's visible body, a revived zest for expressive ceremony, an admission in scientific circles that there is something behind matter, are favourable to an interest in our subject.

In considering afresh the main grounds and reasons of a sacrament as such, it is open to proceed along either of two great lines. We may either consider a sacrament to be a movement of the human towards the divine, or of the divine towards the human. The truth is found in a combination of these two lines of thought. Since, however, it is the divine part of the Sacrament about which there is most difficulty and most incredulity or unbelief, I will begin at the point where there is most agreement among all who value the Sacrament in any sense.

On the lowest ground, then, the Sacrament is a human ceremony, the value of which might be

abundantly vindicated merely at that. Even although the Founder of Christianity had never Himself instituted such a Rite, it might have been open to His followers to devise and practise it, had they been capable of so unique a conception. The craving for symbol and ceremony, and the impulse to create and use them, are instinctive in man. From the little child up to the loftiest philosopher, from untutored savagery up to the ripest civilisation, this human characteristic is universal. The mind instinctively seeks to express its ideas, to give them an objective embodiment, both for the purposes of private satisfaction and of corporate enjoyment. Man is a poet from his birth:

> "And, as imagination bodies forth
> The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name."[1]

What the individual poet does in words, companies of men endeavour to do in symbolic acts. And so every department of life has its ceremonies great and small, be it nuptial, convivial, social, national, religious. In the case of religion, the symbol is especially welcome, because, religious truth shading off so swiftly into the unknown, the symbol seizes upon something apprehensible, and captures and

[1] *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act v. scene i.

retains it. The idea, indeed, creates the symbol, but the symbol reinforces the idea. Not seldom the symbol may overlay, smother, and kill the idea: and in that case the symbol itself may deserve extinction or re-creation, lest a custom once good should now beget corruption. Yet surely no rite ever yet came into use without having had some original vitality. A rite is not so easily and lightly created as a poet's fancy or a verbal phrase; and Timon was in a rollicking vein when he asserted that

> "Ceremony was but devis'd at first
> To set a gloss on faint deeds, hollow welcomes,
> Recanting goodness, sorry ere 't is shown."[1]

The longevity of the Christian Sacraments is partly explainable by the marvellous fitness and beauty of their expressive character. To attempt (as the Quakers have done) to reduce all outward rites and forms to a vanishing point is really to do violence to human nature, besides doing wrong to Christianity as a religion. Nor do the Quakers themselves, any more than affected despisers of ceremony in general, succeed in being at all consistent in their attempt; for what is a studied hue and cut of apparel, or a peculiar habit of speech, or an absence of religious form which in its overt

[1] *Timon of Athens*, Act I. scene i.

negativity becomes itself a form, but another evidence of the inevitable need for external witness to interior thoughts?

There may, then, be ample justification for all solemnities that have truth and right feeling behind them. In connection with religion, if cases arise where there is no express scriptural authority for a ceremony, the decisive considerations must be found in questions about intrinsic fitness, usefulness, and expediency. In an organism like the Christian Church, which lives and acts under a dispensation of the Holy Spirit, there must be a measure of liberty of initiative in such a province.[1] Nor has the Romish abuse of this liberty, in the excessive multiplication of sacraments and ceremonies, induced the Reformed Churches to relinquish the liberty to devise and practise minor usages of an expressive character.

The inherent worth of the Lord's Supper as a mere ceremony is such as might well be admitted by all who in the most general way share in the spirit of Christianity. It is surprising, for example, that a theist like the Rev. Charles Voysey, of London, whose Revised Prayer-Book is so largely modelled upon the Book of Common Prayer, should have no substitute for the Communion—although the Sacra-

[1] So Calvin.

ment of Baptism is represented by a Service of Dedication and Benediction of Children, and the Order of Confirmation by a service of Self-consecration to God.[1] Yet even theists of the Voysey persuasion might profit by a rite resembling the Supper. For what could more beautifully express a recognition of the Great Giver whose essential gifts are food and drink, and what could more suitably symbolise men's human brotherhood or their devotion to a common belief and aim, than the ceremonial act of eating and drinking together? No doubt the disciple of the "Theistic Church" is far enough removed from ordinary Christianity, since the name of Christ is studiously excluded from his service-book. It is time to turn towards something more ostensibly Christian.

The Lord's Supper at once suggests the name of the Lord referred to, and our conception of the Supper greatly depends upon our view of Jesus Christ. The conviction was never so widespread that as a mere man Jesus was the purest and noblest that the world has ever seen. Few cherish the dream that we shall ever look upon His like again.

The religion and morality which the Nazarene

[1] *Revised Prayer-Book*, compiled by the Rev. Charles Voysey, B.A., Minister of the Theistic Church. 1892.

taught appear to the vast majority of civilised minds to be the highest attainable. As a Master of the human spirit, Jesus is unique and supreme. His name is a symbol for the sublimest aspiration and effort of man's soul. How desirable that there should be some single rite by which in all ages and climes and circumstances this Name above every name should be remembered with homage and affection! Do not men find it a good and salutary thing to gather, as at a centenary or anniversary, in order to magnify the work and memory of lesser personages? It binds the sympathies and quickens the ideals of a people when a national hero of any description is thus honoured: how much more valuable is the time-honoured cosmopolitan veneration for Jesus of Nazareth!

Now, if men were to cast about for a simple and natural ceremony fitted to express a love and admiration for Jesus Christ, nothing more appropriate could suggest itself than the idea of a commemorative meal. Such an idea is in accord with the ways and habits of men. Whenever men lay aside the toils of common life to come gladly and willingly together for purposes of intellectual or sentimental fellowship, they gather, if possible, around a friendly board. We have seen how readily in the earliest ages of mankind the feast lent itself to sacramental

uses. Human nature has not changed; and the banquet, on varying scales, continues to fulfil the function of a commemorative and uniting action. The ideal banquet has always included the "feast of reason and the flow of soul." Hence the suitability of the structure of Plato's famous dialogue, "The Banquet." Socrates then, sitting down on the couch, said, "It would be well, Agatho, if wisdom were a thing of such a nature as to pass from those who abound with it into such as want it, when they sit close to one another and are in contact. . . . If this quality attend wisdom, I shall set a high value upon partaking of your couch. . . . Upon this Socrates reclined himself and made his supper. After he and the rest of them had done, performed their libations, sung the praises of God, and gone through the other usual ceremonies, they were beginning to sit in to drinking, when Pausanias opened the conversation."[1]

Had our Master Himself not created the religious Banquet called the Lord's Supper, something distantly approaching to it would doubtless have been invented by Christian piety. But in point of fact the Institution is His own. And while this fact is one of supreme weight for us who believe in Christ's divine authority, it must also be a fact of the utmost

[1] Plato, *The Banquet*. Sydenham and Taylor's translation.

interest to all who revere the name of Jesus. That great career of teaching and example was about to close. The Master knew that His hour was come. Here was His dying request—"Do this in remembrance of Me." What loyal disciple of the Nazarene will withhold obedience?

> "O, but they say, the tongues of dying men
> Enforce attention, like deep harmony;
> Where words are scarce, they are seldom spent in vain;
> For they breathe truth, that breathe their words in pain.
> He that no more must say, is listened more
> Than they whom youth and ease have taught to glose;
> More are men's ends marked, than their lives before;
> The setting sun and music at the close,
> As the last taste of sweets, is sweetest last,
> Writ in remembrance more than things long past."[1]

It is little wonder that admirers of the human character and ethical teaching of Jesus, such as the Unitarians, should take deep pleasure in fulfilling the dying request of their great Master. However sadly impoverished we may think the Sacrament to be under merely Unitarian conceptions, let us rejoice that those disciples of "the Prince of souls" endeavour so far to "do this in remembrance" of Him. Defective theological conceptions of His Person will not, we may be sure, cause Him to withhold all sacramental blessing from the admiring mind and the loving heart.

[1] Shakespeare, *Richard II.* Act II. scene i.

Indeed, it is especially in their Communion Service that Unitarians appear to have difficulty in restricting themselves to a humanitarian view of the Lord Jesus Christ. The mystic power of the Rite is more influential than the dialectic of the dogmatician. It is worth while reproducing from an Unitarian "Common Prayer for Christian Worship"[1] the following words of address to communicants:

"Dearly beloved brethren, now that we have gathered around the table to which our Lord Jesus Christ has himself, in the most affecting words, invited us, let me remind you what are the dispositions suited to a participation in this holy and blessed service of love. Repent deeply of your sins: amend your lives: be in perfect charity with all men: and, above all, give most humble and hearty thanks to our Father in heaven for the word and work of his Son Jesus Christ; who did humble himself even to the death of the Cross, that he might make us in spirit children of God; and who hath instituted this sacred ordinance, that we may remember his exceeding love, and by cherishing a holy fellowship with him be partakers of his joy, and bring forth the fruits of righteousness. Wherefore let us turn toward him with our hearts: then we shall dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we shall

[1] London: E. T. Whitfield, 1886.

be one with Christ and with God; and all will be perfected in one."

When along with the foregoing we take the more fervent and highly-wrought Communion Addresses of Dr. Martineau, we can hardly escape the impression that, particularly in their celebration of the Supper, Unitarians tend to be carried a long way in the direction of orthodoxy by the theology of the heart. However easy it may be in the school to contend for a rationalistic Christology, the atmosphere of the Sacrament seems to induce feelings of adoration that amount to worship of Christ as divine. There is a kind of compulsion towards the deification of Jesus. And, indeed, the apologetic value of the Lord's Supper, in relation to the Person of the Lord, has never been fully demonstrated.

Still viewing the Sacrament as "a human performance," we are on undisputed ground in affirming its utility as a means of public religious witness, fraternal fellowship, and overt obligation. The ordinary public worship of God is itself an invaluable recognition of the Supreme. It is, however, understood that the doors of the sanctuary are thrown open to all comers. The congregation may comprise a large number of irreligious drawn in by the most various sorts of influence. But in the case

of the Lord's Table, after every allowance has been made for casual instances of spurious communicating, it is felt that the guests are there because in some resolute sense they long to do homage to the name of Jesus. Here we have at least a priceless witness to the moral supremacy of Jesus, as well as impressive exhibition of the aspiration of the human spirit towards the moral sublime. It is only by defect that Socinus errs in calling the Sacrament a *signum professionis, tessera communionis.*[1] Moreover, this signation, this token, reacts beneficially upon all engaged in it. And this reaction is both private and corporate in its operation. The individual gains by the mere act of expressing himself, while the common act reinforces the faith of each. Nor is the efficacy of this witness confined to the actual communicants. It extends to mere spectators. And this consideration is a strong argument against the exclusion of the non-communicating.

The excellence of Communion as an act of fellowship can hardly be overestimated. What is there amongst the customs of men to compare with it? Of all the many fraternal rites ever invented or practised, this one is surely the least sectional, parochial, or partisan; the most embracing, harmonising, and truly catholic. Neither race,

[1] Socin., *De Cœna Domini.*

epoch, class, nor sex interferes with the universality of its uniting influence. When we think of all the natural feuds that mar the fair brotherhood of mankind, we may well feel thankful that the central rite of Christianity is one which so accentuates the idea of brotherhood. Whatever charges the socialist may bring against the Church as being ineffective in connection with social wrongs and problems, it remains true that the chief reconciling agency at the present moment is Christianity. And that reconciling ministry would be much more potent if multitudes who at present hold aloof from the Sacrament of brotherhood in Jesus did but lay themselves under the sway of its benign influences. There is much force in the words with which Bishop Gore concludes his recent volume. "For the weaknesses inherent in mere philanthropy and in the current conceptions of brotherhood require for their correction exactly that of which the Eucharist is the very instrument and perpetual renewal—the life of fellowship and intercourse with God in Christ, the life which is 'hid with Christ in God,' and which draws its strength and its inspiration from the divine sacrifice perpetually renewed within."[1]

These religious and fraternal tendencies of the Sacrament cannot but issue in a quickened sense of

[1] Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 288.

obligation. Even in the period of his most subjective treatment of the Supper, Zwingli laid much stress upon the rite as a sign of obligation. The most rudimentary view of the matter inevitably supposes so much. The mere derivative root of the term sacrament implies no less. It is in the very nature of the case that he who presents himself as a communicant thereby gives a pledge that he will make some sincere effort to realise in his life the spirit of the sacred ceremony. And, in fact, there is no more important feature of the thing than just this—namely, the power of this holy rite to touch the springs of the will, and to inspire vital resolution. Who can compute to what extent the lives of multitudes have been purified and advanced by reason of the earnest vows made at the Table of the Lord? If, as Arnold sings,

> "tasks in hours of insight willed
> Can be through hours of gloom fulfilled,"

surely the insight and the will are seldom keener than in this hour of holy communion. And if it be in prayer that the springs of the will are peculiarly susceptible to the divine touch, it is equally true that prayer is seldom so fervent and ingenuous as in this hour of passionate aspiration after the purity and strength, the love and self-sacrifice, the "highest-holiest manhood" of the Prince of souls.

Thus far we have supposed a minimum of theological belief. And it should gratify all parties that in spite of so many controversial difficulties, there is so much common ground for prizing the great Christian Rite. Without any abatement of zeal for a fully developed doctrine of the Sacrament, it is more than ever a duty in these days of theological bewilderment to impress upon all who have any sort of sincere attachment to the name of Jesus, that they will find in the Holy Supper an invaluable means of religious and moral quickening. The first communicants on the night of institution were sadly defective in their Christology. Thomas has the air of a sceptic, Philip of an agnostic; but their personal attachment to the Master constituted in His eyes an ample title to sit at His table. His royal hospitality is not less to-day.

From such general views as the foregoing a long advance lies before us. Much, indeed, might be said against beginning at all in the region just traversed. In considering the origin, authority, and efficacy of the Sacrament, it is the divine aspect of the matter that is all in all. Our theory of the Sacrament will hinge on our theology.

And this, of course, takes us far beyond a general admission, in a merely philosophic way, of a divine movement in religion. Psychologists of the ideal-

istic school might explain the most subjective concepts in terms of the divine. Philosophers of the spiritual love to interpret all religions as expressions of the divine activity in the human consciousness. Did not Hegel strive to interpret the subjective in the human mind as a process of the absolute? Such contributions to the *rationale* of our subject need by no means be overlooked. The sacramental experience of the human soul may to some extent be interpreted in terms of a Hegelian philosophy of spirit. If "religion to Hegel is the plain man's organon for the all-importance of thought or for the sense of unity,"[1] the Sacrament may be viewed as an invaluable constituent of that organon. Or, to quote the philosophic poet, if there be

> "A motion and a spirit that impel
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,"

the pulse of such a divine movement may be said to be exemplified in connection with the Sacrament.

But Christian theology goes far beyond this, and the richness of our view of the Sacrament will depend upon our insight into the unsearchable riches of God in Christ. It is by our doctrine of the Person of Christ, of His work in time and eternity, of the Holy Spirit, of the relation of the Sacrament

[1] *Hegel and Hegelianism.* R. Mackintosh, D.D. T. & T. Clark, 1903.

to all this, that our theory of the Sacrament will be determined.

Now, then, let us take our stand upon the doctrines of grace as we find them in the New Testament. Let us leave aside all consideration of the infinite diversity of Christian thought upon these doctrines, and content ourselves meanwhile with that general fidelity to the New Testament view which finds reflection in the great catholic creeds touching the fundamentals of the Gospel. What, on this broad assumption, is the true doctrine of the Sacrament of the Supper? Is the Rite a mere act of remembrance, or is it something more? Is there a divine objective something in it; and if so, what is that something? Is there a gift from above? Does that gift consist of Christ Himself, His Body and Blood? And if so, what meaning is to be attached to that assertion? If, further, the *Res Sacramenti* be a gift offered from above to man, is there any sense in which an offering is made in the Sacrament by man to God? Is the Sacrament a sacrifice in the proper sense of the word? These are all-important questions, involving others not less important in their own place.

That at least in this great Action communicants make loving remembrance of their Lord, is admitted upon all hands. But however precious this mode

of remembrance may be (so precious is it that there can be no true Communion without it), we cannot emphasise too strongly the fact that Christendom as a whole has ever been strenuous in maintaining that the Sacrament means a great deal besides, and that far more important than any devout or loving act on our part is the substantial gift bestowed upon us by God through this Holy Ordinance. To emphasise this should indeed be superfluous, if it were not that so many members, and (what is worse) teachers in all our Protestant communions, grievously err by defect in this weighty particular. Such defect appears, *e.g.*, whenever the main stress is laid upon the Supper "as a token of faith in the Saviour and of brotherly love,"[1] to quote from Independents who have profited too little from their earlier master, Owen. Many Baptists lag far behind C. H. Spurgeon in his Communion sermons upon Christ as "The Best Bread," and "The Meat and Drink of the New Nature." Both Broad and Low representatives of the Church of England are equally at fault, tested by their own Articles and best divines; while not a few Presbyterians decline from their own standards and chief apostles.

A supper enjoyed by guests is essentially *something*

[1] Independent Declaration of Faith, 1833.

given by the host. And in all the accounts of the Lord's Supper the idea of something proffered by the Lord to His disciples is the first, the salient feature. The very first word of Jesus, according to the Synoptists, was "Take." But, as Dorner[1] points out, "Take, eat," would be meaningless, or at least the meaning would be unnatural, as expressive of mere commemoration, since believing commemoration presupposes reception. It is in St. Paul's report that most is made of "remembrance"; but there the call to remember is preceded in the case of the bread by the statement, "This is My body," and in the case of the wine by the statement, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood." And obviously as occurring between these statements of the Lord and His exhortations to remembrance, there is to be understood His act of handing the bread and the cup to His friends.

But what exactly is the divine gift? It may be answered in a general way that all religious blessing is something given by God; that God employs any right religious service as a channel of blessing; that any sort of quickening is a gift, even as St. Paul longed to "impart some spiritual gift," or as he speaks of all grace as something given "according to the measure of the gift of Christ." True as

[1] *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv. 312.

this may be, the gift in the Sacrament is something more definite and palpable, and more firmly connoted by the distinctive Rite.

More justice is done to the nature of the gift conveyed through the Sacrament, when stress is laid upon such spiritual blessings as are perhaps most obviously and immediately recognised to characterise believing communion. Thus the gift of forgiveness, as it is the first blessing offered by the gospel, is likewise the gift of which the humble communicant is at once aware in the Sacrament. And so Luther seems at times to single out forgiveness as the one supreme blessing enjoyed in the Supper. Christ's Body and Blood he calls "a treasure given for the pardon of sins." It was natural that one who magnified justification by faith as almost the sum and substance of the gospel, should view the central Christian Rite in the dazzling light of that glorious doctrine. And it will always be natural that every man's view of the Rite should be vividly coloured by his distinctive apprehension of the gospel. Whatever is apprehended as the grand gift of God in the gospel of His Son will also be found equally pre-eminent in the Supper. Yet, we would contend, no catalogue of special blessings received can suffice to express the fulness of the gift offered in the Holy Supper. The nature and the greatness

of that gift can be expressed only by saying that it consists of Christ Himself. The real gift to be obtained through the Sacrament is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.

We shall have to attempt some explicitness as to what is meant by this statement. Let us first see how the statement itself accords with the accounts of the Institution. When Christ told His disciples to take and eat *this*, He meant his Body and Blood, —as is admitted by all, so far as the words are concerned, and apart from the question of their interpretation. As the disciples received the Elements physically, so (in some sense) they were to receive His Body and Blood. Now, looking at the way in which the Lord and His disciples were situated that night, would not the simplest and most natural paraphrase of His words be, "Receive Me"? The expression, "the Body and Blood of Christ," signifies His whole personality. What it is to receive Christ; what it was for the disciples in the Upper Room, and what it is for disciples to-day; in what sense one Person can be received by others; in what manner that is possible through the Sacrament; to what extent such a reception is ideal, and to what extent the ideal is intertwined with what is called "substance,"—these and many other questions may demand explanation. Meanwhile the

ground is cleared so far, if it can be agreed that in the Sacrament Jesus Christ offers and gives Himself, in some true and real sense, as a present and positive gift.

What is it to receive Christ? What is it for the human personality to receive the divine? It is hard to answer such questions in any profoundly scientific sense. We are greatly ignorant of the deep processes that operate in this mysterious nature of ours. Neither theology nor metaphysics nor psychology carry us very far beyond the data of common experience and the simple intuitions of faith. Experience, however, teaches all men the reality of personal force. In ordinary life the power of a strong and good personality is distinctly felt by others to be a positive contribution to their own capital. Virtue goes out from the stronger into the weaker. The weaker is a recipient of the "vital spirits" of the more vivid nature. A strong and sympathetic character, eager to give itself, to spend itself, for others, has the most astonishing and almost unlimited power of self-communication.

Now the richest and most liberal nature ever known among men is that of Jesus Christ. All who come in vital contact with Him know themselves to be gainers. In proportions largely conditioned

by their own receptivity and faith, they feel that the divine life so abundant in Him tends to infuse itself into them. They realise the truth of His own figures of speech descriptive of the influx of His life into theirs,—that He is the vine and they the branches, that He is living water to the thirsty drinkers, heavenly bread to the famished eater, meat indeed and drink indeed,—"If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is." Faith knows Christ as a veritable gift. And this gift, in its nature and extent, becomes fully intelligible and self-consistent only in the light of New Testament Christology.

If, then, this experience of Christ as properly a gift be found peculiarly real in the Supper, there should be no difficulty in attaching definite meaning to the assertion that what Christ gives therein is truly Himself, — Himself in all the offices and relationships which He has sustained and does sustain towards mankind collectively and individually. In the Last Supper with His disciples, the First of the New Covenant, He gave Himself to them in a manner conditioned by the circumstances. He being not yet crucified and risen, not yet perfected and glorified, the gift of Himself could not have that completed character which it afterwards assumed. Yet that First Communion was a

true one, in that the partakers enjoyed a fresh reception of Christ through the sacramental medium. After the Lord had been sacrificed, after He had risen and ascended and shed forth His Pentecostal Spirit, after His disciples' eyes were opened to the significance of all that, the gift of God in His Son became unspeakably amplified. Henceforward the exalted Saviour carries within Himself the gathered force of all His redemptive achievement, and communicates that force to His people through all the media of grace, specially the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. And, finally, however little we may be able to imagine the precise mode in which the perfect communion of eternity is to be realised, it is promised that the heavenly period shall be gladdened by a blessed Marriage Supper, in which the affiance of Christ and His own shall be as intimate, as mutual, and as indissoluble as is the most ideal union between bridegroom and bride, the most unimpeded marriage of true minds.

The proper gift, then, of the Sacrament is the manifold entity of the God-Man as He now exists. It would be a meaningless and gratuitous confusion of thought to identify Christ's sacramental Body and Blood with the specific material atoms which once composed His fleshly frame. Romish modes of thought favouring this confusion are open to the

huge objection that they obscure many aspects of Christ's Person which are eloquently set forth in a right doctrine of the Sacrament. The Mass is, above all, Christ as a Sacrifice. But (apart from the question of repeated sacrifice) the sacrificial aspect of Christ is far from being the only aspect in which He is to be viewed through the Sacrament. And this criticism is applicable not only to the Romish tendency, but also to any Protestant tendency to view the action exclusively as a pictorial announcement that Jesus died upon the Cross.

The truth is that there is no doctrine of the Person and work of Christ that is not comprised in a full view of the Lord's Supper. Here we see the doctrine of the Incarnation set forth by these material emblems, bread and wine, reminding us of the real flesh and blood of Jesus as He lived our human life. Paschasius was so far right in chiefly regarding the Sacrament in the light of the Incarnation. Here also, since these emblems have a reference not merely to Christ as He was, but as He is, we are reminded of the eternally human character of Jesus, and of the fact that so far from having discarded connection with our human nature, He has rather taken up that nature into Himself to dignify and spiritualise it for ever. The doctrine of the Incarnate Logos is here expressed, and we

are taught that Jesus must be apprehended as the Truth. Apart from truths, facts, ideas, the Sacrament were little better than incantation and mummery. "To *think*, that is the true triumph of the soul. To offer thought to the thirst of men, and to give to all as an elixir the idea of God, to make conscience and knowledge fraternise in them, and by this mysterious confraternity to make them just men—such is the duty of true philosophy. . . . The ideal must be made air, food, and drink for the human mind. It is the ideal which has the right to say, 'Take of it, this is My flesh, this My blood.' Wisdom is a sacred communion."[1] And so Jesus was careful to secure an organic connection of truth with the ritual act. "The flesh profiteth nothing. The *words* that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." The cup is the New Covenant, and that covenant means an infinitude of truth. And it is significant that upon the occasion of the Institution, His own celebration of the Supper was marked by the unusually deep and ample communication of truth reproduced in John xiii.–xvii. Moreover, besides so much truth about Himself, the Supper implies a whole world of ethical truth.

While the Death of Christ is not the single fact or idea embodied in the Supper, it goes without

[1] Victor Hugo, *Les Miserables*.

saying that the Rite is all but unthinkable apart from that death. "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do *show the Lord's death.*"[1] If in some sense the death of Jesus is "the centre and consummation of His work,"[2] it must likewise in some sense be the centre and acme of the Eucharist. The Ritualist and the Evangelical join hands here: however much they may differ as to whether the Sacrament itself is a sacrifice, they agree in the view that the supreme informing idea of the Sacrament is the Saviour's sacrificial Death. And indeed the ineffable glory of the Sun among Sacraments vanishes with the departure of a sublime doctrine of Atonement.

It is less usual but equally important to employ the Lord's Table as a witness to the truth of Christ's Resurrection and of ours. In this Mystery the Lord is present as risen from the dead, ascended, and exalted in power. Without such a belief we might be excused for regarding this ceremony as a melancholy memorial of a noble life extinguished in tragic defeat. But the whole atmosphere of the First Christian Passover, so far as the Lord is concerned, is one of anticipated triumph. It was an hour when the very soul of the wide world seemed to be "brooding upon things to come." The fore-

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 26. [2] Denney.

boding gloom which filled the Apostles' minds at the thought of their Master's death, He sought to irradiate by promises of His joyful return from the grave. The New Passover in which He called upon them to participate, He meant as emblematic of One whose death would be but a step to a more glorious activity. In this connection we have to remember not only the express words of Institution, but the whole converse in the Upper Room. In the act of Institution itself, however, Jesus made a declaration bearing upon His future relationship to His Kingdom. "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom."[1] Whether Jesus, whose disciples "did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead,"[2] ever engaged in the New Passover with them, may be matter for doubt; but certainly the fellowship of that First Supper was presently renewed in that progress of the Kingdom which the disciples at once began to further by the aid of Christ's Pentecostal union with them. And if the still better interpretation should refer us to the heavenly period for the time when the kingdom of God "shall come,"[3] we are thereby led to contemplate the celestial exaltation and triumph of the Redeemer. Our own personal continuance

[1] Matt. xxvi. 29. [2] Acts x. 41. [3] Luke xxii. 18.

after death is at the same time certified, since it is with His disciples that He shall "drink it new."[1] The Christ, therefore, that we have in the Sacrament is both the pledge of immortality and the means of resurrection glory. The powers of eternal life wielded by Christ "are meant to transform even this mortal body into the likeness of His image";[2] and those powers find a means of operation in the Sacrament. "Whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."[3] The Christian Fathers especially saw in that promise a reference to the Supper, which they therefore called a "medicine of immortality."[4] And therefore Dorner asserts that the Holy Supper operates "as the principle of pneumatic corporeity such as will be exhibited in the resurrection body."[5]

The Christ of the Sacrament is also One of whom we sing in our great catholic hymn that "We believe that Thou shalt come to be our Judge." St. Paul employs the Lord's Supper as a reminder of the fact of judgment, and of the Second Coming of the Lord.[6] But at His Table this Judge is even more evidently to be seen as a merciful and faithful High

[1] Matt. xxvi. 29. [2] Dorner. [3] John vi. 54.
[4] Ignatius. [5] *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv. p. 330.
[6] 1 Cor. xi. 26–29.

Priest, offering both gifts and sacrifices for sins, and having compassion on the ignorant and on them that are gone out of the way.[1] Christ's presence in Heaven for us is an intercession; He is present there as a Lamb "as it had been slain"; and the memorial of His Death is the earthly counterpart of His heavenly Intercession.

Such, then, are some of the attributes of Christ reflected and the offices exercised in the Holy Supper. And besides all theological categories, there are many other aspects in which the Lord appears through this medium. The various titles and figures under which He appears throughout Scripture are capable of being easily and fittingly related to the Supper. Is there any special character in which Christ makes Himself known to private faith? That character will be recognised, and even be invested with unique beauty, as He makes Himself known in the Breaking of Bread. How remarkable is the elasticity of this Rite! Bounded in its norm by one brief unvarying formula, it becomes a universe as infinite on the one hand as the Being of Christ, and on the other as the receptivity of faith. If the *Res Sacramenti* may be so construed, it is no extravagance for faith to exclaim with a conviction and fervour singularly appropriate to the Holy

[1] Heb. v. 1, 2.

Communion—"Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift!"

To assert the reality of such a gift in the Sacrament is in some sort to assert the Real Presence of Christ. This is an expression which unfortunately has become unpleasing to many who suspect it of importing something too like Transubstantiation. The resemblance, however, is more apparent than real, as we hope to show in dealing with the distinction between the Presence in the Elements and that in the Sacrament as a whole. In any case, there should be no difficulty regarding the general statement that Christ is present with His people in the sacred action. To state that fact is to affirm a Real Presence. Nor can the personal Presence of Christ be banished in favour of that of the Holy Spirit. To say that it is the Spirit rather than the Son who is present, is a dangerous misuse of the truth of the hypostasis,—a misuse which would so dissociate the Second and Third Persons of the Godhead as to result in tritheism.

To insist, however, that the Presence of Christ is spiritual does not invalidate, but rather strengthens its reality. But what is spiritual presence? In a well-known passage,[1] Jeremy Taylor gives two definitions—namely, a presence after the manner of a

[1] *Real Presence*, i. 8.

spirit, and a presence to our spirits. He prefers the latter definition. Both ways of putting the matter, it seems to us, are of value in the connection. For, since Christ is not corporeally present as He was in the days of His flesh, or as He may be in the days of the regeneration of all things, in what manner can He be now present with us except after the manner of a spirit? And to what in us can He be present except to our spirits? "Spirit with spirit can meet."[1] To be conscious of Christ's "Presence" is simply to be conscious of the living energy of the Lord. And if the vital powers of His Nature are felt in the Eucharistic Service, there can be no disadvantage but rather a gain in predicating His "Presence."

Further, it would be consistent with this to call such a Presence objective. Technically, the doctrine of an objective Presence in the Eucharist is "the consecration of the elements themselves to become sacramentally identified with the body and blood of Christ,"[2]—a doctrine the accuracy of which would depend upon one's interpretation of "sacramentally." But, leaving aside the question of the Elements *per se*, the theory which the present writer is endeavouring to construct certainly demands an objective Presence of Christ amongst the communicants of His

[1] Tennyson, *The Higher Pantheism.*
[2] Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 73.

Body and Blood. The Sacrament in which so substantial a reality is encountered is something more than "a flight of adjectives."

At the same time, this is not to view the Sacrament as a mode of existence for Christ apart from the presence of communicating souls. The simple idea of presence implies a subject as well as an object. It is to communicants as subjects that Christ is objectively present: take away the subjects, and to speak of presence at all is a meaningless use of words. Hence our insistence upon the necessity of faith on the part of communicants; and hence the truth of the statement that it is in the believer's heart that Christ's Presence is realised. When, therefore, we say that Christ is in the Sacrament, we can only mean that He is *mediately* present therein. In the last resort we find Hooker's position to be the accurate one—"The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."

Up to this point we have consistently spoken of Christ being present in the Sacrament as contrasted with the Elements merely. The distinction is one of the highest importance; and if it had more frequently been kept in mind, a considerable deal of superstition might have been avoided. When we say that Christ is present in the Sacrament, what we

strictly mean is that the Sacrament is a means whereby Christ makes Himself felt by His people. Now, although so simple in its formula, the Lord's Supper is really a sacred action of a very complex character. Much is implied which is not expressed by the few words of the Institution, both in point of religious belief and of ceremonial act. A real Communion involves faith in the Gospel of the Son of God, together with a whole series of ritual actions. Of these actions the principal are the gathering together in the name of Jesus, the worship of God in prayer and praise, the hearing of His Word read and declared, the confession of sins and of faith in Christ, adhesion to the Church as the Body of Christ, recognition of the unity of the members of the Church, the offerings of the faithful; and then the consecration of the elements by thanksgiving, blessing, or invocation, together with the pronouncement of Christ's words, followed by the fraction and distribution; also on the part of the communicants the believing reception, the dividing perhaps among themselves, along with all interior acts of devotion. Here we have the process of a great spiritual function, in the course of which Christ makes Himself specially present as a Power and a Gift. Amongst the instruments necessary for this function, the most distinctive though not the

only material symbols are bread and wine. A cup and a table are expressly mentioned in Scripture as symbolic articles. Now, by common consent, none of these material things has any sacramental value apart from the canonical Rite. There is therefore no warrant for singling out bread and wine, or both together, and attempting to view them as the particular centres of the Lord's Presence. Certainly within the Sacrament the things that answer pictorially to Christ's Body and Blood are the Bread and Wine, but the analytic attempt to press the identification is really a kind of afterthought which causes us to part company with the informing idea of the whole. Although it is believed that the same grace (in a different mode) is given in the Sacrament of Baptism as in that of the Communion, the spiritual grace is not identified with the water *per se;* and it is to be deplored that in the case of the second Sacrament so much perverse rigour has been expended.

This over-rigorous identification of the Elements with the Substance of Christ creates many needless difficulties of thought as well as many regrettable customs. It tends to foster a meaningless materialisation of the Rite. It ascribes a spurious virtue to the Elements when they are wrested away from the sacramental action as a whole. It results in such practices as Reservation, Procession, and Perpetual

Exposure,—practices which may be said to exercise a beneficial influence in certain directions, but which in other and more important directions do the most serious injury. It makes of the Sacrament "a maimèd rite" in the shape of Communion in one kind; for if the real Body and Blood be in every particle of bread and every drop of wine, reception is sufficiently attained by means of one kind;—an idea which never could have been entertained if Christ's Presence had rather been associated with the entire act of eating and drinking.

Perhaps the weakest part of Dr. Gore's recent work is his section entitled "The relation of the spiritual gift to the bread and wine."[1] Is the spiritual gift, he asks, merely "attached to the act or process of eating and drinking?"

Dr. Gore, in treating of "the relation of the spiritual gift to the bread and wine," declares that from the first the Church "has believed that, by consecration of the portions of bread and wine which have been solemnly set apart or offered, the spiritual gift of Christ's body and blood is in some way attached to these elements (however the relationship is to be described) before they are eaten or drunken, and independently of such eating and drinking." The truth of Dr. Gore's statement hangs upon the

[1] *The Body of Christ*, p. 71, etc.

parenthesis. But how is the relationship to be described? After quoting from typical early Fathers, Dr. Gore himself concludes: "I do not think it can be denied that these Fathers would have shrunk from any formulated teaching of Christ made present on the altar under the forms of bread and wine." Then a little later he asserts it as a proper view held by the Church, that the body and blood are "made present objectively, in undefinable identification with the bread and wine."[1] What is this "relationship," this "identification"? Whatever else it may be, it is a relationship or identification strictly conditioned by the connection of the Elements with the Eucharistic Service as a whole. Therefore, however permissible it may be in the common language of piety to say that Christ is present in the bread or wine, it seems to us more scientific and accurate to say that Christ is present in the Sacrament rather than in the Elements. Such a view lends intelligible meaning to the form of consecration. For words intelligently uttered and heard can constitute (along with the appropriate symbols) a sacrament; whereas, if the words of consecration are thought to bear directly upon the material elements, these words become more a magical incantation than a reasonable factor in the

[1] Page 94.

Rite. Had the function of the Elements been considered in more intrinsic connection with the progress of the Communion as a whole, Christendom would have been spared much superfluous disputation about such metaphysical theories as Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, Impanation, or Insubstantiation.

One of the nice points of controversy, and one upon which much hair-splitting has been expended, is the question whether Christ's Body is received by unworthy Communicants. If the broad principle be agreed upon (as it is) that unworthy communicating involves more or less condemnation, the minutiæ of the question seem somewhat puerile. It should not be difficult to agree that (on the one hand) the unworthy Communicant can never actually receive Christ as really as he receives the Element, and that (on the other hand) by engaging in the Sacrament he brings the Lord near to him as a Judge.

After this disclaimer of materialistic theories, there remains a certain qualification which it will be neither inconsistent nor useless to admit: this, namely, that the lines of demarcation between the material and the spiritual are often wavering, sometimes imperceptible, and generally difficult to detect. There is much, as we all know, to be said for the view that after all there is no such thing as self-

existent matter, and that the only reality is thought. Berkeley's theory lends itself so readily to the very "highest" sacramental systems, that it is surprising how little use has been made of it. Even the late Professor Huxley used to admit that it was impossible to refute Berkeley. And the most modern investigations seem to show that there is no limit to the penetrativeness of matter by spirit. How does the human personality suffuse the bodily frame? The spirit of man we believe to be something distinct from his flesh, and though in one view spirit cannot be imprisoned by matter, yet we speak of a man being "in the flesh." May it be that the real bane of the Mass is not so much its apparent materialisation of Christ's presence, as the radical distortion of the idea of the Supper into that of a sacrificial performance in the hands of a caste? How readily and how naturally imagination and emotion can spiritualise the material! Are we not familiar with this process in the case of heirlooms, relics, places, buildings, gifts, symbols, and tokens of every description? There could be no better illustration than that afforded by the reverence we feel for a volume of the Bible. We call it, as we hold it in our hand, the Word of God. It is a precious casket containing the truth, a treasury of the Holy Spirit. Yet, of course, no book can contain

thought. Thought can exist only in thinking minds. The book with its inanimate paper and lifeless letters is crass matter. But when it is used by a thinking person we can speak of it as being replete with thought; and grasping it in our hand we feel it to be the very sword of the Spirit. Similarly Ignatius calls the Gospels σὰρξ Χριστοῦ; and Augustine says that believers possess Christ "by the sign of the Cross." We need not then be too severe with pious souls who feel as though the sacred Elements were fused with the divine Being of the Lord. No charitable person will quarrel with the tolerant words of one far enough removed from anything superstitious, that clear-sighted scholar, Dr. Sanday: "It may well be that those who seem to be on the side of materialism are at the bottom of their minds seeking to assert and emphasise their sense of the reality of sacramental grace of which they have personal experience and conviction. If they do not deceive themselves, if they do not let the outward take the place of the inward, if they show the true fruits of the Spirit, we may give them credit for sincerity, and receive what they say with the respect to which all genuine conviction is entitled."

And there is a final caveat, with which we shall pass from this section of the subject. However

necessary analytical disputation may be when we are forced to refute error and to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, let us not forget how true it is for the normal religious life that "the mysteries of the faith are believed unto salvation, but are analysed with neither blessing nor reward."[1] It is much for faith to know that somehow the glorious Saviour is present in the New Testament Passover, and is wholly in us and we in Him, if we do but discern the Lord's Body. "In the order of nature the Sacrament is sign and shadow; but in the order of grace, which is supernatural, it is substance and life."[2]

A few words may be said here upon the difficult question as to how Christ's Body can both be in Heaven and also in the Sacrament. Ubiquitism, involving a property of immensity belonging to Christ's Body, may be dismissed. It may also be agreed that our ignorance of the metaphysical nature of space, substance, heaven, and the glorification of a body, constitutes an insuperable barrier in the way of clearly defined thought. Luther frankly gave the problem up.[3] Calvin, who was capable of penetrating into such regions farther than most, confesses that it is too high a mystery for his mind

[1] Manning, *Sermons*, vol. iv. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Conference of Marburg, A.D. 1529.

to comprehend or his words to express; "and to speak more plainly, I rather feel than understand it."[1] There is a touching and beautiful simplicity in the way in which so thoroughgoing and daring a speculative thinker takes here the position of the most childlike faith. "He declares that His flesh is the meat, and His blood the drink, of my soul; I give my soul to Him to be fed with such food."[2] Where angelical doctors have feared to tread, we need not lightly rush in.

It is serviceable, however, to have some kind of thinkable view, confessedly imperfect as it may be. If, then, we are constrained to think of the Lord Jesus as being visibly manifest in heaven as in a place, in the proper dimensions of such a personal form as that which He was seen to wear after His Resurrection, how is that celestial Body present amongst His people on earth? To visit His people, He cannot be supposed to divest Himself of His substantial humanity, and to come as a disembodied spirit. Neither does it meet the case to call in the agency of the Holy Spirit, and to say that it is merely the Holy Spirit who is personally present. It is, again, somewhat forced on Calvin's part to say that "we gain His presence when He raises to us Himself." Many of the Reformers were indeed satisfied

[1] *Institutes*, bk. iv. chap. xvii. sec. 32. [2] *Ibid.*

with the view that the only way to receive of Christ's substance is to lift up our minds by faith above all things worldly or sensible, and thereby to enter into Heaven, that we may find and receive Christ, where He dwelleth undoubtedly very God and very Man.[1] And such a way of thinking is valuable as emphasising the truth that in all sacramental experience there is a supra-sensible sphere of action which may be regarded as being on the same plane as heaven. But this view does not altogether fit into the conception of an earthly Sacrament; and it savours of a *dernière pensée*. The initial idea of the Supper is that Christ *comes to us* where we are. How then does He in His Body and Blood come to us? "It is sufficient," says Dorner, "that His presence is subject to His loving will. . . . His freedom cannot be fettered by the limits of space and time. . . . His loving will can find no insuperable obstacle in anything physical."[2] All this is true, but still is vague for our particular point.

Something positive and apprehensible may be found in the fact that what comes to us is a measure of the power, the energy, the virtue, the grace of the God-Man. The Body and Blood of Christ means, Christ in the fulness of His Divine

[1] Knox's *Common Order*, 1564.
[2] *System of Christian Doctrine*, vol. iv. sec. 127.

Manhood. Take the everyday analogy of a person being present to us in the body. The bodily presence of our friend is advantageous as expressing his personality in a manner specially sensible to us. His face, voice, figure, handshake, enable him to establish a relationship in which the feelings of his heart and the ideas of his mind, as well as the magnetism of that physical temperament and constitution which form an essential and integral part of his personality, have free play upon us. Now, if the vital personality of Jesus Christ touches us through the medium of the Supper, that fact is represented by saying that His body is present therein. This way of putting the matter has not been developed as it might have been by Calvin, who, however, gives the germ of such a thought when he says that in the Sacrament, "Christ, out of the substance of His flesh, breathes life into our souls, nay, diffuses His own life unto us."[1] By believingly laying hold of the Sacrament, we form between Christ's body and ourselves a nexus comparable to that found by the woman who laid hold of Christ's garment, the hem of which conveyed "virtue" out of Him. Mr. J. C. Lambert[2] speaks scornfully of Calvin being "tempted" to this view, and classes

[1] *Institutes*, bk. iv. chap. xvii.
[2] *The Sacraments in the New Testament.*

this view amongst "dreams and speculations." But Mr. Lambert is wrong in imagining that such a view necessitates either an essential differentiation of subsequent Suppers from the First, or a miraculous glorification of Christ's Body in the Upper Room. We would reply to this writer, that there must be some difference, though not an essential difference, between the First and later Suppers; and that in respect of the idea of virtue going out from the Body of Christ, a measure of virtue from Christ's Body or Person did go out to the disciples in the Upper Room.

No doctrinal treatment of the Eucharist would be complete without a clear reference to the extent of its sacrificial character. The Romish theory of the Mass as a real propitiatory sacrifice has been so often and so convincingly refuted, that it might seem gratuitous to trouble much about it at this time of day. But every age begets its own temptations to be lured back towards so seductive a heresy. Amongst the dangers in our day are these. The human soul longs for something expiatory in religion; and when modern preaching, owing to speculative and critical difficulties, gives little place to the idea of atonement, the mysterious Sacrifice of the Altar seems to supply a defect. If our more open-minded way of interpreting Holy Scripture

brings its undoubted advantages, one of its perils is a certain readiness to accept such developments of religious ideas as commend themselves to personal predilections apart from the express sanction of the scriptural letter. Theology herself is very willing to consider any idea upon its own merits. Professor Paterson rightly holds in respect of the Sacrifice of the Cross, that there is "a commission to theology not to regard itself bound by the New Testament data for a theory of the Atonement, but to re-interpret by its own thought the nature and the mode of efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ."[1] Re-interpretations of the Eucharist should be equally welcome, in proportion to their truthfulness. Certain current reinterpretations, however, seem to mean a relapse towards the Romish view of the sacrificial value of the Sacrament.

In what sense may our Rite be called a sacrifice? In the etymological sense, the Latin *sacrificium* has a very wide signification. Anything *made sacred* by being offered or dedicated to God, or by being reserved for religious uses, might be called a sacrifice. Augustine gives the name generally to "every act which is performed by us with the purpose of joining us to God." More strictly, it is a religious act, "in which a material oblation is presented to the

[1] Art. on "Sacrifice" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

Deity, and consumed in His service, and which has as its object to secure through communion with a Divine Being the boon of His favour."[1] In the looser or more generic sense the Eucharist may clearly be called a sacrifice, but not in the stricter or more specific sense.

We have seen that a great many outward and inward acts go to make up the great sacred action called the Lord's Supper, and every one of these acts is of the nature of those "spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."[2] In common with the prophetic view of Old Testament sacrifice, we may consider our Rite "as a vehicle for the expression of the sentiments, and for the revelation of the spirit of the life, of those who sincerely served or sought God."[3] If all prayer be thus sacrificial, especially so is that prayer which is offered in the peculiarly holy circumstances of the Supper. Praise sung to God is expressly called a sacrifice by the writer to the Hebrews, in a passage which would ever seem to refer directly to the Eucharist: "By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name."[4] The element of thanksgiving,

[1] Prof. Paterson, art. on "Sacrifice" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

[2] 1 Pet. ii. 5. [3] Paterson, *ut supra.* [4] Heb. xiii. 15.

whether in praise,[1] prayer, gifts, or service, is especially described in Scripture as being sacrificial; and the Eucharist is *the* Thanksgiving. The faith behind the service of worship is spoken of by St. Paul as a sacrifice, at the same time as he speaks of his own martyrdom as a sacrifice united with and added to the Philippian faith and service. "Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith."[2] Nor is this the only passage in which he speaks of persons being offered as Christian sacrifices. Christians are to present their bodies "a living sacrifice,"[3] and the conversion of the Gentiles is "the offering up of the Gentiles."[4] Now, while the more real sacrifice of persons consists in character and conduct, yet Christians present their persons to God as they approach the Lord's Table.

That aspect of sacrifice in which a material gift is prominent finds some place in the Eucharist. Every material thing necessary to its celebration, and devoted to that sacred purpose, is an offering or sacrifice to God. At every fresh celebration there is a fresh offering of the creature elements of bread and wine to be set apart for holy use. The material value of the Elements may be small, since the Love-feast and profuse gifts in kind to the poor have

[1] Ps. cvii. 22, cxvi. 17, etc.
[2] Phil. ii. 17.
[3] Rom. xii. 1.
[4] Rom. xv. 16.

been so largely abolished; yet the offering of the Elements is not nugatory in so far as expression is given to the truth that the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. Nor is it to be forgotten that the entire expense of a Communion may prove a considerable item. But the most costly of the material oblations consists in the money-gifts made at Communion. Such gifts in themselves are described in the New Testament as sacrifices. The Philippian gifts to Paul are called "an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."[1] The Apostle is not afraid to invest such a sacrifice with the same imagery as that with which he describes the sacrifice of the Cross, "as Christ also hath loved us, and given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour."[2] It is also in connection with a probably Eucharistic reference[3] that the writer to the Hebrews adds, "and to do good and communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."[4] It is not only ancient tradition, but a right and ever-present instinct that moves Christians to make their offerings more than ordinarily generous on those occasions when they partake of the Communion. With regard to all

[1] Phil. iv. 18.
[2] Eph. v. 2.
[3] Heb. xiii. 15.
[4] Heb. xiii. 16.

such acts of worship and offering there is, then, express scriptural sanction for speaking of them as sacrifices. Needless to say, however, they are on a plane altogether inferior, and in a category altogether different from the one and only Sacrifice of the world's Redeemer.

There are, again, certain derivative senses in which Protestant writers attempt to make the Eucharist a sacrifice of the same genus as that of Calvary. It is little to our purpose for Cave to say that "in a certain loose sense the Lord's Supper may be called a sacrifice, inasmuch as it was deliberately associated by its founder with the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament."[1] For the association is one of the sharpest possible contrast.

Others have said that the Old Testament sacrifices were sacraments, and that if those older sacraments could be called sacrifices, so also may the Christian Sacrament. Scott[2] specifies the sacramental notes of the ancient sacrifices, which were signs of spiritual realities. Manning in an Anglican sermon calls the sacrifices of the Law "sacraments looking forward to the Cross,"[3] and the Eucharist "a sacrifice looking backward to the Cross." And Sadler[4] remarks that

[1] *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice.*
[2] *Sacrifice: its Prophecy and Fulfilment.*
[3] *Sermons*, vol. iv., "The Only Sacrifice."
[4] *The One Offering*, p. 75.

"it was simply the memorial character of these [Old Testament] acts of worship which constituted them sacrifices"; and that therefore the memorial character of the Lord's Supper is no objection, but rather an additional reason for calling it a sacrifice. But this way of likening the old and the new is fallacious. A Jewish sacrifice, however many ideas might gather round it, was in itself a substantial sacrifice. It was not viewed as a mere *sign:* it was the actual *thing*. In this kind of comparison it is not the Eucharist that should be put forward as a counterpart of the Jewish sacrifice, but the bloody oblation of the Cross itself.

There is more correspondence with reality in Dr. Moberly's[1] conception that the life of the Church has a sacrificial character, and that in the Sacrament she makes an ostensible offering of her life. The Christian must die with Christ. Christ was a sacrifice to God; the Church must be a sacrifice also, since the Body must resemble the Head. "The Church in its acts of Eucharistic worship identifies itself with the Death of Christ." From this conception, however, two most important deductions must be made. First, the Church's life, even though it were many times more sacrificial than it is, can never attain to the unique category

[1] Quoted by Sanday and reproduced by Gore.

of Christ's Sacrifice. And, secondly, suppose that the life of the Church did deserve to be credited with so sublime an efficacy, it would be the daily life of the members rather than the ceremonial act which would constitute the real sacrifice. For it is much more of a crucifixion to live the life of service than to participate in the Lord's Supper. Our criticism, however, of this view leaves room for the admission of this measure of truth in it, namely, that the act of self-surrender to Christ made in a true Communion may be the spring, nay, must be the spring, of actualised self-sacrifice.

More than usual interest has recently been shown in the connection between the Eucharist and the Heavenly Intercession of Jesus.[1] Christ, it is urged, offers a sacrifice in Heaven; the Eucharist is an earthly counterpart of His high-priestly activity, and thereby it becomes imbued with a sacrificial character. Let us look into this. Is the sacrifice which Christ presents His earthly sacrifice of obedience unto death? This certainly is the only sacrifice named in the Epistle to the Hebrews in connection with our Lord's heavenly High Priesthood. And this sacrifice had been so thoroughly performed prior to the Saviour's entry into Heaven, and such a definitive period had been put to it, that the idea of

[1] Gore, Milligan, etc.

a never-ending immolation (not to mention a *repeated* immolation) is excluded.[1] The only sense in which Christ now offers the Sacrifice of Calvary is that He presents, so to speak, its efficacy, pleads its virtue, and as a sympathetic High Priest relates His Sacrifice to each succession of souls, and to each crisis of the individual life. Now, to put into operation the powers won by sacrifice is not strictly to continue making that sacrifice. If, therefore, Christ's Intercession is not properly sacrificial, neither is the earthly counterpart, the Eucharist, sacrificial. There is thus only a secondary kind of truth in Sadler's statement[2] that "the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, inasmuch as it is the means of presenting, and enabling us to partake of, the One Mactation of the Cross. While it is true that in the Supper Christ is present, as He also is in Heaven, as the "Lamb as it *had been* slain," the pluperfect tense reminds that the slaying and the sacrifice are for ever past.

But it is further contended that in His heavenly activity on man's behalf Christ is at present sacrificing Himself. "The offering of our Heavenly High Priest," writes Dr. Milligan,[3] "includes in it a

[1] Heb. vii. 27.

[2] *The One Offering*, p. 73.

[3] *Heavenly Priesthood*, p. 266. Quoted by Paterson in art. on "Sacrifice" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.

present and eternal offering of His life in Heaven. But the duty of the Church is to repeat and represent the life of her Head in another and a higher world; and in the Eucharist she appropriates and reproduces the priestly offering of Him in whom she lives. As our Lord's offering of Himself never ends nor can end, so in that offering His people, organically united to Him, one with Him, must be offered, and must offer themselves; and this they do in the expressive and touching symbols of the Eucharist." What justification is there for this view?

Although there is little scriptural warrant for representing Christ as offering His heavenly life for a sacrifice, it must be admitted that the idea of His Intercession suggests something sacrificial. In what the Intercession consists is nowhere clearly explained in Scripture, and we must be chary of anthropomorphic conjecture. But can we think of sympathetic helpful love, of timely succour, of "tender care, love, and desires for the welfare, supply, deliverance, and salvation of the Church,"[1] apart from something sacrificial? Perhaps not. Only, in the same sense the life of God the Father is also sacrificial. To speak, therefore, of the self-sacrifice of Christ in His state of exaltation, however pardonable as a poetic expression, is not quite satis-

[1] Owen on "Christ's Intercession," *Epistle to Hebrews*.

factory. For, besides disturbing the balance of faith by transferring the centre of interest from Christ's finished historic work to His less fully understood activity in Heaven, it tends to dim the glory of His Exaltation, as though the shadow of the Cross still darkened His celestial path. True as it is that Christ's mediatory life in Heaven is a life for us, the introduction of the appellation "sacrifice," is somehow not altogether happy. And even if it were from some points of view appropriate, the Eucharist cannot under this head be called sacrificial. At best it could only be a means of grace in dependence upon Christ's heavenly mediation. And however permissible it may be for faith to read into the Sacrament certain truths not specified in Scripture, the absence of scriptural encouragement for Dr. Milligan's view must be held to be unfavourable to its importance. Such a possible view is eclipsed by the intense light which streams down upon the Supper from the Cross of Calvary.

Our views upon the sacrificial aspects of the Eucharist must necessarily determine our conceptions of Christian priesthood. In so far as all Christians are made "a kingdom of priests"[1] unto God, and in so far as the Christian sacrifices of prayer, praise, charity, and self-consecration find a

[1] Rev. iv. 10.

sphere of exercise in the Lord's Supper, the Sacrament may be called a priestly function. If Christians are at any time "an holy priesthood,"[1] they are specially in that character while engaged in the full Communion of the Lord's Table. And it is very remarkable that the only New Testament instance in which the technical term ἱερεύς is applied to men is that in Rev. iv. 10, where it is used of Christians in general. Being thus unofficially used, the term cannot be meant as carrying into the new priesthood the particular idea of slaying a victim for sacrifice. It is rather the priestly privilege of approach to God that is now said to belong to the whole society or kingdom of believers in Christ. "The only priests under the gospel, designated as such in the New Testament, are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood."[2]

The absence of any scriptural application of the sacerdotal title to Christian ministers, whether Apostles or others, is indeed significant. Equally remarkable is the obscurity of the celebrant in all New Testament references to the Supper. It is also notable that while an express commission to baptize was given by the Lord, no persons are recorded to have received any official commission

[1] 1 Pet. ii. 5. [2] Lightfoot, *Commentary on Philippians.*

to administer the Supper. And while we do not forget that the organisation of His Church was largely left by Christ to be determined under the guidance of His Spirit, still in all religions the cleavage between the sacerdotal caste and the common worshippers is so radical, that, had Christ contemplated a sacerdotal order in His religion, He would almost certainly have given some indubitable lead in that direction. Nor is this desideratum for the sacerdotalist supplied by any of the Apostles. How conspicuous is the absence of any sacerdotal reference in the catalogue of orders of ministration given by St. Paul in the fourth chapter of Ephesians. The only word having any tinge of sacerdotal colour in this connection is λειτουργεῖν and its correlatives; but this word is far from being specific enough to be of any consequence here. In the New Testament references to the breaking of bread, it is rather the company as a whole than the leader of the worship that breaks bread. This corporate character of the priestly function is brought out in the Coptic Liturgy, "where the people generally by their responses are clearly shown to take a part and share in the consecration prayer."[1]

But, it may be said, "it matters not a straw

[1] A. C. Headlam in the Oxford Discussion on Priesthood and Sacrifice.

whether the *name* of priests was given,"[1] provided it can be shown that the work devolving on the Christian minister is really sacerdotal. Our concern with the sacerdotal claim is limited to its connection with the Lord's Supper; and that Rite having been shown to be no *verum ac proprium sacrificium*, we shall proceed no further along this line than to refer to a view which has recently excited some interest, namely, that contained in Dr. Moberly's *Mediatorial Priesthood*. What he contends for is an idea of sacrifice purified from all grosser elements, and transcending sacrifice as an institution in all its forms,—a pattern of sacrifice laid up in the heavens and invested with none but heavenly attributes, which may be fulfilled as much in Christianity as in Judaism, nay, far more. He starts from the fact that the death of Christ is described as a sacrifice. . . . And it is one of his points that the conception of sacrifice in the case of Christ is not to be too closely identified with His death; the death is an element in it under the given conditions, but not the whole or even the greatest part of it. The offering of Himself to the Father by our Lord Jesus Christ was an act of sacrifice. . . . But what Christ does, that the Church which is the body of Christ also does. And what the Church does, that

[1] Sadler, *Church Doctrine Bible Truth*.

the ministry who are its executive organs also do. Now the Church through the Eucharist unites itself with the Sacrifice of Christ. Therefore the New Covenant has its sacrificial system as well as the old. That system is connected not only with the act of Christ, but with the sacrificial activity of the whole society; and within the society finds its special expression in the priesthood. What the Church does in the Eucharist, it does through an ordained ministry as its organs.

That there is truth in the late Professor's view seems obvious enough. But it tends to an exaggeration of the priestly function of the minister, as distinguished from the great High Priest above, and His simple believers below. Dr. Moberly admits that the ceremonial act of the minister is of a derived character: he might have said that the derivation is twofold, namely, from Christ and from His people. And, seeing that it is only by the distant gleams which it reflects of the Divine Sacrifice, and by its function as an organ of the general Body, that the Christian priesthood is an official one at all, we may conclude that Dr. Moberly's view does not sufficiently correspond either to New Testament language, or to the commonly understood idea of sacrifice, to warrant us in giving greater currency to the description of

the Christian ministry as a sacrificing priesthood. While that holy ministry is a God-given thing by no means adequately prized, Christianity does not require any official priesthood such as human nature in its cruder religious endeavour has always been so prone to create.

CHAPTER XII

LITURGIES OF THE SACRAMENT

WITHOUT entering minutely upon the province of liturgics, we shall find it useful to review the main features of sacramental ritual in the more important periods and sections of the Church.

Beginning with the infant Church, we find that although the New Testament nowhere supplies us with a complete rubric of the Supper, it is possible to construct from various references a pretty full order of Communion as practised under the Apostles.

The essential features are at once to be found in the First Supper of the Lord. We may pass over the preliminary preparations, which consisted of the procuring of a room "furnished and prepared" with the material requisites for the Feast. The order of the old Passover having been followed up to the point of transition from the old to the new, it was probably just after the last portion of the Paschal Lamb had been eaten, and the third cup

drunk, that the Lord *took bread.* This bread was probably the piece of unleavened cake allowed as dessert. The first ritual act, therefore, was this taking of bread to be set apart for the special use. The fact of its being unleavened was one of purely Old Testament significance. The subsequent use of unleavened bread in the Christian Rite may be defended on the double score of a desire to preserve a link with the older Passover, and to employ the very same kind of bread as that which the Lord took. But, on the other hand, it may be replied that a distinction from rather than a continuity with the older ceremony is characteristic of our Sacrament, and that the substitution of leavened bread better expresses the idea of the Supper as nutriment, besides introducing a sense of that ease the absence of which was a feature of the hasty exodus from Egypt.

The Lord's next act was to give thanks or to bless. What was the precise tenor of this prayer of Jesus? Did it consist entirely of an expression of thanks to God for mercies, general or particular? Did it contain the different species of prayer represented in what is now the recognised type of a great Eucharistic prayer of Consecration? We are tempted to regret that we have no such report of this prayer of Christ such as that of the prayer recorded in John xvii.

The absence of such a report entitles the Christian Church to much freedom in the framing of its Eucharistic prayers. The occurrence, however, of the word *bless* leads one to suppose that besides the rendering of thanks, there was something of the nature of petition to God that He would make the thing referred to beneficial in accordance with the purpose contemplated.

The next act, the breaking of the bread, is a point which ought never to be omitted, not even where it is a custom to have the bread prepared in the shape of a quantity of cubes. The first words of Christ after His prayer are, "Take, eat"; but that command cannot be dissociated from the assertion, "This is My body." St. Luke's addition, "which is given for you," and St. Paul's, "which is broken for you," are doubtful readings, although their beautiful fitness may make us loath to omit them.

Some consider that the prayer is the chief instrument of consecration, while the Roman school lays all the stress upon the assertion. It seems most reasonable to look upon the whole sacramental action as constituting the real consecration. It was while uttering the words quoted that He *gave* to them; and this giving may be termed the administration. The injunction, "This do in remembrance

of Me," is given in reference to the bread, by St. Paul and St. Luke.

The next act is the taking of the cup, for which there was, according to St. Matthew and St. Mark, a second thanksgiving prayer. Although St. Luke makes no mention of this, perhaps St. Paul refers to it in his phrase "the cup of blessing." The assertion, "This cup is the New Testament in My blood," or "This is My blood of the New Testament," has in Luke the addition, "which is shed for you," and in Mark, "which is shed for many," and in Matthew, "which is shed for many for the remission of sins." St. Paul alone makes the further addition, "This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me." St. Matthew prefaces the assertion about the cup being the blood of the covenant with the command, "Drink ye all of it," while St. Mark informs us that "they all drank of it." Christ's prophecy about eating and drinking in the Kingdom of God ought perhaps to be counted part of the Institutional words. The truths which the Lord unfolded to the disciples as they sat at the Table give abundant precedent for the sermon in Communion. His concluding intercessory prayer both reminds of the place which the thought of His heavenly Intercession should occupy in our service, and also sets us the example of interceding for

others at the Table. At the same time it justifies our making the intercession after rather than before the administration. What place had the singing of praise in the First Supper? Psalms from the Hallel would be sung in the course of the Old Passover, and it is possible that more than one of the Psalms of the latter part of the Hallel were sung at some stage or stages of the New Passover. The singing of at least one hymn ere they left the Upper Room is recorded by Matthew. This hymn was almost certainly one or several of Psalms cxv.–cxviii., or cxx.–cxxvii. The reading of the Holy Scriptures is the only typical part of a Communion Service unrepresented in the Upper Room.

If Christ's eating and drinking with His disciples during His resurrection-life on the earth was occasionally Eucharistic, what course of action was followed? It were impossible to say more in answer to such a question than that certain essentials of the First Supper would be repeated.

After the Lord's Ascension, frequency of celebration is the first thing to strike us. The bread would now be the leavened or ordinary bread found in believers' houses. The celebrant would be an Apostle, or, in the absence of an Apostle, some member of the company esteemed for age or piety. A feature of the celebration recorded in Acts xx. is the length of St.

Paul's sermon, and the probability that at least the major part of the sermon followed the participation. If (as seems likely) the central act in the religious assemblies of the earliest Christians was the Eucharist, then we can gleam some interesting liturgical information from 1 Cor. xiv. The mention of "blessing with the spirit" and "giving of thanks" seems to refer to the Eucharistical invocation and thanksgiving. We gather that the liturgy was far from being fixed, since there was so much room for the exercise of individual gifts, such as tongues, prophesyings, and perhaps ecstatic singing. It would seem that the company joined in a great "Amen" at the close of the Eucharistic prayer—a valuable practice, since it associates the people with the minister in the act of consecration. St. Paul's directions about prayers in 1 Tim. i. probably apply to the prayers of the Lord's Supper, and his instructions about laying by in store on the Lord's Day similarly refer to the offering of money gifts made at the Supper. Is it likely that the Lord's Prayer would be omitted? The memorable form in which certain articles of the Creed were cast, *e.g.*, "Great is the mystery of godliness, etc.," leaves the impression that recitals of the Creed were familiar.[1] In the matter of praise, we may observe

[1] 1 Tim. iii. 16.

the rise of Christian psalmody. "When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm,"[1] or a doctrine, or such-like. And St. Paul's insistence upon the necessity of singing with the understanding, together with the reference to teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, points to the occurrence of fresh utterances of Christian inspiration,—that is, to Christian hymns. What appear to be fragments of such hymns are found in the later New Testament,[2] as well as half-stereotyped doxologies. The repeated directions about saluting one another with the holy kiss of charity,[3] together with the occurrence in very early liturgies of the kiss of peace, may indicate that the kiss formed an item in the ceremonies of the Supper. The lights, "many lights,"[4] which were used at Troas, were probably not ceremonial, but merely illuminative, although the allusion to their numerousness may have to do with the festal character of the Supper.

It is a question whether in the time of the Apostles anything of the nature of a liturgy was written down. Dr. Neale, perhaps on slender grounds, judges that certain passages common to St. Paul

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 26.
[2] Eph. v. 14, etc. ; 1 Tim. i. 17, etc.
[3] Rom. xvi. 16, etc.
[4] Acts xx. 8.

and to the Clementine Liturgy are rather quoted by the Apostle from the liturgy than *vice versâ*. However that may be, and whether or not there was any written order of service, there was at least an understanding of what would be necessary to a proper observance of the Rite. "Let all things be done unto edifying," and "Let all things be done decently and in order," are the firm injunctions of the Apostle.

Liturgical aspects of the Eucharist in the sub-Apostolic age may be found in the *Didaché* and other early documents referred to in Chapter III. of this volume. We pass meanwhile to the category of liturgies properly so called.

The exact date of the great primitive liturgies is lost in the mist of antiquity. It is the Eastern liturgies that claim our attention first. In them all the truth connected with the Eucharist is, in Dr. Gore's view, more strikingly and richly repre-presented than anywhere else. The Oriental liturgy may be divided into two parts, the Pro-Anaphoral and the Anaphoral, the former extending to the Sursum Corda and the latter thence to the end. Our description of main features will apply to the service mostly used in the present day by the Greek Church, namely, that entitled the Divine Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. After introductory

prayers for the divine peace, readings from Holy Scripture, and antiphons by the choir, the properly Eucharistic action is begun by the priest unfolding the corporal. The deacon then orders the expulsion of the catechumens. After prayers for purification and after the cherubic hymn, the priest and deacon go to the Prothesis (a sacred antechamber) to procure the bread and wine. Their return with these elements is called the Great Entrance. The veiled paten and chalice having been placed upon the Table, sundry prayers being said, they are kissed by the priest; and the deacon cries, "The doors! the doors!" to secure the ceremony against profane gazers. The people now say the Creed, after which the holy gifts, having been fanned by the deacon, are unveiled by the priest. Here we reach the more essential parts of the service: the great Thanksgiving, embodying a recital of the Institutional words; the offering of the "reasonable and unbloody sacrifice"; the Epiklesis, that God would "send down Thy Holy Ghost upon us and on these proposed gifts, and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ," "and that which is in this cup the precious Blood of thy Christ," so that they may be to those that participate, for purification of soul, forgiveness of sins, communion of the Holy Ghost, fulfilment of the kingdom of heaven, boldness to-

wards Thee, and not to judgment or to condemnation. This "reasonable service" is offered on behalf of the departed, the Dyptichs of the departed being read by the deacon, and on behalf of all sorts and conditions of the living. Prayer is made for the interchange between heaven and earth, in that the venerable gifts may be received unto God's holy and heavenly and spiritual altar, and the divine grace and gifts of the Holy Ghost be sent down in return. Secret and articulate prayers beseeching sanctification are said by the priest. Then, elevating the holy bread, he exclaims, "Holy things for holy persons," a reponse being sung by the choir. The bread is then divided into four parts by the priest, who says, "The Lamb of God is broken and distributed; He that is broken and not divided in sunder; ever eaten and never consumed, but sanctifying the communicants." Next he takes the upper portion of the bread, inscribed with the I.H.C., and puts it into the cup, saying, "The fulness of the cup, of faith, of the Holy Ghost." Blessing the warm water with the words, "Blessed is the fervour of Thy Saints, always, now and ever, to ages of ages," he pours a sufficiency into the cup, saying thrice, "The fervour of faith, full of the Holy Ghost." The priest now communicates, having spoken as follows: "The blessed and most holy

Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ is communicated to me, N., priest, for the remission of my sins, and for everlasting life. I believe, Lord, and confess of thy mystic Supper to-day. Let not, O Lord, the communion of Thy holy mysteries be to my judgment and condemnation, but to the healing of my soul and body." The deacon communicates in the Bread. Then the priest takes the holy chalice in both hands and drinks three times, saying, "I, N., priest, partake of the pure and holy Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of my sins and for eternal life." And, wiping the cup and his own lips with the covering, he adds, "Behold, this hath touched my lips, and shall take away my transgressions, and purge my sins." The deacon communicates in the cup, and the doors of the Bema having been opened, he shows the chalice to the people, saying, "Approach with the fear of God, faith, and love." Then those who are to communicate draw near, and hold their arms crossed upon their breast, while the priest distributes the mysteries to each, saying, "Now the servant of God is made partaker of the pure and holy Body and Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and life everlasting." After sundry prayers, removal of the Holy Things, distribution of the Antidoron

or unused bread, and disrobings, the priest makes the dismission.

Passing to the Western liturgies, the first representative which we select is the Petrine or present Roman Mass. Without dwelling upon the opening part, containing Ps. xlii., the Confiteor, Absolution, Introits, Kyrie Eleison, Gloria in Excelsis, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, and Creed, we may note the course of the principal part, which begins with the Offertory. At the beginning of the Mass the priest has placed on the altar a chalice with a silver paten, both covered with a silk veil, which he now takes off, preparatory to offering the Bread, and the chalice (which he mixes with water) for all faithful Christians living and dead. The hearts of priest and people are also offered in prayer. The joint priesthood of the people is reflected in the Orate Fratres: "Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty." The altar bell is presently rung to announce the Preface, which consists of the Sursum Corda, a Thanksgiving, and a Sanctus accompanied by a second bell. The Canon of the Mass is begun by the priest kissing the altar to show that he is united with the invisible High Priest; and the third or warning bell is rung. The Consecration takes place by the elevation of the Bread, with the

utterance of the words, "This is My Body," and by the elevation of the wine, with the utterance of the words, "This My Blood," the Consecration bell being rung three times in respect of each Element. After prayers for admittance into the company of the saints, the Lord's Prayer, and a supplicatory mention of the Virgin, the priest, breaking the Host, puts a part of it into the chalice, and the Agnus Dei is sung or said, after which the priest's Communion is made. Should the people communicate (which they usually do only at early Mass, since they are supposed to receive fasting), they go up to the altar rails when the bell rings just before the Communion of the priest, who, having communicated, absolves the people. Then, taking the Ciborium (or cup containing the Host), he holds it up to the people, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world." The prayer "Domine, non sum dignus," etc., is repeated three times by the priest, the people striking their breasts each time; after which the priest goes down the altar steps and places the wafer on the tongue of each communicant, saying, "May the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul to life everlasting, Amen." After ablutions, brief thanks and supplications (in which the prayers of Mary and Joseph are requested), the priest says at the altar:

"O Holy Trinity, let what I have done be pleasing to Thee; and grant that the sacrifice which I, though unworthy, have offered up in the sight of Thy Majesty may be accepted by Thee; and through Thy mercy may I and all for whom it has been offered receive forgiveness of our sins, through Christ our Lord." Kissing the altar, and turning to the people, he blesses them in the name of the Trinity. In Masses for the dead the blessing is not given, since the Church does not claim the same power over the dead as over the living. The Mass is concluded with a reading from the first chapter of St. John's Gospel, and the clerk's exclamation, "Deo Gratias."

Remove from the Mass the prayers to the saints and the prayers for the dead, and correct the theory of sacrifice, and there remains little for a Protestant to object to, so far as doctrine is concerned. Transubstantiation, Mariolatry, and sacrificing priesthood are rather to be found in the doctrinal standards than in the Roman Service of the Eucharist.

Protestant orders of service being so numerous, our descriptions of them must be briefer. Their ritual, moreover, being less elaborate, they can be brought into smaller compass.

Luther, as we might expect, both from his doctrine of Consubstantiation, and from certain

conservative traits in his temperament, preserved as much as he could from the Roman missal. In 1526 he published the German Mass, the vernacular being substituted for the Latin. In this service-book he closely follows the Roman order, beginning with the Confiteor, Introit, Kyrie Eleison, Gloria in Excelsis, etc. The altar was furnished with candles and crucifix, which were classed amongst a number of things which Luther called indifferent. He allowed the elevation of the Host, a custom which continued at Wittenberg till 1543. Preaching, however, was restored to a more honourable and indefeasible place. Congregational singing was encouraged. The idea of the service as a meritorious sacrifice was excluded. He announced a very large liberty to churches in the matter of modifiying the service in accordance with edification, with the result that there are varieties of the Lutheran service, some of which, along with Luther's own, are printed in the *Agende für Christliche Gemeinden des lutherischen Bekentnisses.*[1]

Luther's general principle of liturgical reformation may be given in his own words: "Non esse nec fuisse umquam in animo nostro omnem cultum dei prorsus abolere, sed eum, qui in usu est, pessimis additamentis vitiatum, repugnare, et usum pium

[1] Nördlingen, 1853.

nonstrare." With Jacoby we may sum up Luther's treatment of the Mass in three statements: He stands for the freedom of divine service; he objects to it being overlaid with wearisome prayer and song; and he leaves certain doubtful practices to the discretion of the minister (*Die Liturgik der Reformation.* Hermann Jacoby).

From the *Kirchenbuch für die evangelische Kirche in Württemberg* (1843) we take a specimen order. The minister begins with a somewhat lengthy address upon the Christian salvation and the value of the Sacrament. Thereafter he may pronounce an absolution, followed by a brief prayer for assistance, ending with the "Unser Vater." Then the minister says: "Listen in faith to the words of the Institution of the Holy Supper," and reads from 1 Cor. xi. In handing the Elements to the communicants, the minister says: "Take and eat; that is the Body of Jesu Christ, given unto death for your sins. (So do in remembrance of Him.) Take and drink; that is the blood of Jesu Christ shed for your sins. (So do in remembrance of Him.)" A short thanksgiving after Communion is immediately followed by the Deuteronomic benediction.

At Geneva the liturgy of the Mass was substantially abolished in favour of the simple form arranged by Calvin in 1536. After the ordinary

Sunday service has been performed as far as the sermon, "on the day of Communion the minister adverts to it at the end of his sermon, or indeed, if he sees cause, makes it the sole subject of his sermon, in order to expound to the people what our Lord means to teach and signify by this ordinance, and in what way it behoves us to receive it." The sermon is followed by the intercessory prayers, to which are appended a prayer in reference to the Sacrament and the Creed, to testify in the name of the people that all wish to live and die in the doctrine of Christ. The prayer referring to the Sacrament runs thus: "And as our Lord Jesus Christ, not content with having once offered His Body and Blood upon the Cross for the forgiveness of our sins, has also destined them to us as nourishment for eternal life, so grant us of Thy goodness, that we may receive this great blessing with true sincerity of heart and ardent desire, and endued with sure faith, enjoy together His Body and Blood, or rather Himself entire, just as He Himself, while He is true God and man, is truly the holy bread of heaven that gives us life. Fit us then on this day thus to celebrate the happy remembrance of Thy Son."[1]

The Institution is then read from 1 Cor. Then

[1] Abbreviated.

follows a lengthy address, in which the unworthy are excommunicated, the intending communicants urged to self-examination, the penitent comforted and encouraged. "Let us believe then," the address proceeds, "in these promises which Jesus Christ, who is infallible truth, hath pronounced with His own lips, namely, that He is indeed willing to make us partakers of His own Body and Blood, in order that we may possess Him entirely in such a manner that He may live in us, and we in Him. And although we see only bread and wine, yet let us not doubt that He accomplishes spiritually in our souls all that He shows us externally by these visible signs; in other words, that He is heavenly bread to feed and nourish us unto life eternal. . . . With this view, let us raise our hearts and minds on high, where Jesus Christ is, in the glory of His Father, and from whence we look for Him at our redemption. And let us not amuse ourselves with these earthly and corruptible elements which we see with the eye, and touch with the hand, in order to seek Him there as though He were enclosed in the bread or wine. Then only will our souls be nourished and vivified with His substance, when they are thus raised above all terrestrial objects, and carried as high as heaven, to enter the kingdom of God where He dwells. Let us be contented then to have the

bread and wine as signs and evidences, spiritually seeking the reality where the word of God promises that we shall find it."

This done, the ministers distribute the bread and cup to the people, who are warned to come forward with reverence and in order. Meanwhile some Psalms are sung (in the French version of Marot and Beza), or some suitable passage of Scripture is read.

After the dispensation there is this Thanksgiving: "We offer Thee immortal praise and thanks, O heavenly Father, for the great blessing which Thou hast conferred upon us, miserable sinners, in bringing us to partake of Thy Son Jesus Christ, whom Thou didst suffer to be delivered to death for us, and now impartest to us as the food of everlasting life. And now, in continuance of Thy goodness towards us, never allow us to became forgetful of these things, but grant rather that, carrying them about engraven on our hearts, we may profit and increase in a faith which may be effectual unto every good work. Hence, too, may we dedicate the remainder of our life to the advancement of Thy glory and the edification of our neighbours, through the same Jesus Christ Thy Son, who in the unity of the Holy Spirit liveth with Thee and reignest for ever. Amen."

Calvin's order is thus simple even to baldness. The omission of a prayer sanctifying the elements is very strange, in consideration of the express scriptural precedent for "blessing." The prayers, however, are of a very noble cast.

The liturgy of the French Reformed Churches is closely modelled upon that of Calvin. An abbreviated intercessory prayer ending with the Paternoster having been offered immediately after the sermon, those present who intend neither to communicate nor to assist by their presence receive the benediction and retire during the singing of a hymn, or while a "*morceau*" is being played on the organ. The Corinthian Institution having been read, an address like Calvin's, but shorter, is given, and is followed by a prayer of thanks for union with Christ through the Sacrament, and of self-consecration. A hymn is next sung, that suggested being No. 60, which begins, "*Agneau de Dieu, par tes langueurs.*" The pastor then invites an approach to the Table, and enjoins the company to elevate their hearts on high. Taking his position behind the Table, the pastor breaks the bread and says, "The bread which we break is the communion of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ"; then, taking the cup, he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless is the communion of the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ"

which is shed for you." The participation being over, the pastor remounts the pulpit and delivers a brief exhortation to walk worthily. He then offers a prayer of thanks and of supplication for grace. The assembly thereafter stands to sing the Hymn of Simeon, after which the pastor says, "Receive, my brethren, the benediction of the Lord"; the form used being the Deuteronomic, concluded with these words, "Go in peace, remember the poor; and may the God of peace be with you and with your families, now and for ever!" A footnote informs us that for the dispensation of the Holy Supper each Church has its particular usages, which it is at liberty to conserve. It is, however, recommended that the communicants sit at tables, as best realising the first form of the Holy Supper. After each table, the pastor makes a prayer, terminated by the benediction.

The English liturgies in their bearing upon doctrine have received attention in the former part of this volume. Their offices for Holy Communion are largely a transcript and modification of the earlier British missals. In this chapter we confine ourselves to the current form, entitled The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion. It is prefaced

with some important directions not always obeyed in the present day, the term "Table" being conspicuous. The service opens with the Lord's Prayer and the Collect for cleansing, after which the priest rehearses the Ten Commandments, each Commandment being followed by the people's "Lord, have mercy upon us, etc." Then comes a collect for the Sovereign, and one for the day. The Epistle and Gospel are read, and the Nicene Creed is confessed. A sermon or homily is *de rigeur*. Returning to the Table, the priest reads the sentences of the Offertory, and the alms being brought to him he places them reverently on the Table. He next places the Elements on the Table, and prays for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth, the occurrence of this Intercession at so early a point being peculiar. The Exhortation, a beautiful composition, is followed by an Invitation to draw near. The general Confession of Sins is sealed with the Absolution pronounced by the priest, who also reads some comfortable words from Scripture. The Sursum Corda, Thanksgiving and Trisagion lead up to the prayer of Humble Access. The Prayer of Consecration has for its vital points a petition "that we receiving these, Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His

Death and Passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood," and a recital of the Institution. The blessing of the Elements, unexpressed in words, is indicated by the priest laying his hands upon them. The fraction takes place during the prayer. The minister (and any other clergy) having communicated, he delivers the bread and wine to each communicant, with the words of delivery: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving. The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful." When all have communicated, the minister returns to the Table, and reverently places upon it what remains of the consecrated elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth. The service is concluded with the Lord's Prayer, a prayer for acceptance, or one of thanks for incorporation in Christ's Body, the Gloria in Excelsis, and the Benediction.

Seeing that the English Prayer-Book has a controversial interest at the moment, we may point out a few of its significant features in that connec-

tion. "Table" is consistently used in preference to "Altar." The absence of verbal consecration of the elements, held to be necessary by the Greek and the Scotch Presbyterian Churches, should make Anglican precisians more tolerant of what they consider to be deficiencies in communions other than their own. The single place in which the word "sacrifice" occurs as applied to the Eucharist is in one of the concluding prayers, where, however, the sacrifice is said to consist of praise and thanksgiving, and of ourselves, our souls and bodies.

In his recent work, Dr. Gore devotes a chapter to "Our present Communion Service." We agree with him in his criticisms to the effect that the prayer of Access should have a much earlier place, that there should be a commemoration of the Ascension, Resurrection, and heavenly Intercession of Christ, as well as of the Holy Ghost, and that the thanksgiving for membership in Christ's Body should not be alternative but invariable. It is less satisfactory to find one whose own preaching does so much honour to that office, remarking (in respect of the provision for a sermon or homily at every celebration) that "we have somewhat wearied of this perhaps more than abundant provision."[1] His desire for inclusion of prayers for the dead is one

[1] Page 278.

which would meet with widespread opposition.

Passing to Scotland, we may take as our typical Reformation liturgy that of Knox in his *Book of Common Order*, which contains a section headed "The manner of the Administration of the Lord's Supper." A preliminary note indicates that the celebration should take place once a month. The Communion Service proper begins after the usual intercessory prayer (with Lord's Prayer and Creed) succeeding the sermon. The minister commences by calling on his hearers to mark and consider "how Jesus Christ did ordain unto us His Holy Supper, according as St. Paul maketh rehearsal in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians," — which rehearsal is then read. A full and impressive exhortation is made from the pulpit, whereupon the minister descends and seats himself at the Table, the other communicants also taking their places. Then he takes the bread and proceeds to offer the Eucharistic prayer, in which thanks are offered for God's mercies in creation and redemption.

"This done, the minister breaketh the Bread, and delivereth it to the people, who distribute and divide the same amongst themselves, according to our Saviour Christ's commandment, and likewise

giveth the Cup: during which time some place of the Scriptures is read, which doth lively set forth the death of Christ, to the intent that our eyes and senses may not only be occupied with these outward signs of bread and wine, which are called the visible word, but that our hearts and minds also may be fully fixed in the contemplation of the Lord's death, which is by this Holy Sacrament represented." After all have communicated, a prayer is offered, in which God is thanked for "so excellent a gift and treasure as to receive us into the fellowship and company" of Christ; and grace and constancy are requested. No further exhortation is given; and the people having a psalm of thanksgiving, by preference the 103rd, the final blessing is recited.

The rubric regarding Eucharistic prayer states that the minister may give thanks "either in these words following, or like in effect." And as there was in Scotland some dissatisfaction with a form "wherein there is not one word of Lord bless the elements or action,"[1] we may be sure that such an omission would frequently be remedied.

Knox's *Common Order* embodied the Church's law regarding public worship from 1564 till 1645, when the Westminster Directory for the Public

[1] Row: Calderwood's *History*, vol. iv. p. 1.

Worship of God was adopted, with its section "of the celebration of the Communion or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." The first sentence states that the Communion "is frequently to be celebrated, but how often may be considered and determined by the ministers, etc." Sermon and the usual Presbyterian prayer being ended, a short exhortation is to be made, expressing the benefits of the Sacrament, warning the unworthy, and inviting the penitent. Thereafter "the minister is to begin with sanctifying and blessing the elements of bread and wine set before him (the bread in comely and convenient vessels, so prepared that being broken by him, and given, it may be distributed amongst the communicants; the wine also in large cups), having first, in a few words, showed that these elements, otherwise common, are now set apart and sanctified to this holy use by the word of institution and prayer." The Corinthian Institution is to be read, and may be explained and applied. The model for the Eucharistic prayer is admirable. We extract this sentence, in which the minister is directed earnestly to pray to God "to vouchsafe His gracious presence and the effectual working of His Spirit in us, and so to sanctify these elements both of bread and wine, and to bless

His own ordinance, that we may receive by faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us, and so feed upon Him, that He may be one with us and we one with Him."

The words of delivery are given for literal repetition, though "other the like" are permitted. The Directory being unsurpassed by any liturgy in point of the dignity of the words of delivery, we must reproduce them. "According to the holy institution, command, and example of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, I take this bread, and having given thanks, break it and give it unto you: Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you." Similar words accompany the giving of the Cup. In the midst of the words just quoted there occurs a parenthesis in which it is directed that the minister communicate. After all have communicated, the minister may put them in mind of the grace of the Sacrament, and exhort them to walk in it. A solemn thanksgiving follows. The benediction is doubtless taken for granted. It is curious that no mention is made of singing, though, of course, there was no intention to exclude it. A collection for the poor is supposed.

This Directory represents the last legislation of the Scottish Church regarding the celebration of Communion. The eighteenth century saw very

infrequent and perfunctory observances. But in the course of the nineteenth century more care began again to be given that all things be done decently and in order. The three chief sections of the Scottish Church, the Established, the Free, and the United Presbyterian, came to have societies devoted to the improvement of public worship, and these issued manuals in which attention is given to the order of Communion.

The Service contained in the Euchologion of the Church Service Society is both full and careful. The usual Morning Service having been slightly curtailed, the Communion begins with the Exhortation of traditional tenor. The 35th Paraphrase, beloved at Scottish Communions, is then sung. The Elements are brought in by the minister and his assistants, probably elders, and placed on the Table—a custom reminiscent of the Greek Great Entrance. The communicants having taken their place, they are greeted with a benedictory salutation by the minister, who then reads the Corinthian Institution, and gives an address on cardinal points of the faith. Here the celebrant, who may now take the paten and cup into his hands, enters upon the great Eucharistic Prayer, which is marked by special amplitude, containing as it does opening thanksgivings, the Nicene or Apostles' Creed (confessed

to God), Prayer of Access, a form of Sursum Corda, Thanksgivings for Redemption, Trisagion, Hosanna, Invocation, and Lord's Prayer. The words of delivery are from the above-mentioned Directory. The Elements are now distributed; and if there are too many communicants to be accommodated at one dispensation, those who have been served withdraw during the singing of the 103rd Psalm, and others take their place, when the Service is renewed as before. All having participated, they are exhorted to thankfulness; and there is offered a concluding prayer of thanks, self-dedication, intercession for the Church militant, and thanks for the Church triumphant. The Song of Simeon having been sung, the Service is closed with the benediction.

The new Directory for the Public Worship of God, prepared by the Public Worship Association of the Free Church of Scotland, contains valuable directions for the order of the Lord's Supper, although the section upon that Sacrament cannot be described as a fully articulated liturgy. First it is suggested that "Fencing" may be suitably performed on the Sabbath preceding that of Communion; and that where the old Sacramental Fast-day has disappeared one or more Preparation Services should be held, say, on the Friday evening and Saturday afternoon, at either of which Services the

Young Communicants should be received. "Special pains should be given to have the whole of the praise, prayers, Scripture readings, and sermon in harmony with the spirit of a Communion time as a Christian festival, a time of special religious privilege and gladness. A list of suitable Psalms and Hymns is given, and appropriate themes of discourse are specified. Simultaneous Communion is recommended. The "fine linen, clean and white," it is strongly urged, should cover not only the Table before the minister, but all the Tables where the communicants sit. Quotation is made from the Act of Assembly, 1645, ordaining that besides the Action Sermon, "there be a Sermon of Thanksgiving after the Communion is ended." Then follows an Outline of Order of Communion which may be copied here:—

1. Words of Institution read.
2. Fencing.
3. Psalm or Hymn.
4. Thanksgiving and Consecration Prayer.
5. [Short Table Address. Optional, may precede 4.]
6. Distribution of Elements, with our Lord's words repeated.
7. Short Table Address.
8. Psalm ciii.

9. Closing Prayer.
10. Psalm, Hymn, or Doxology.
11. Benediction.

Valuable liturgical notes are given upon each of these parts of the Service; and model prayers are quoted from Knox, Westminster Directory, St. Giles' Order, and Bersier's *Projet de Révision de la Liturgie des Eglises Réformées de France.*

The Liturgy of the Scottish Episcopal Church, compiled by Scottish bishops in 1636 and revised by Laud and others, is used as a form alternative with the English Communion Office. Besides the Invocation on the Elements previously referred to, it is distinguished by a permission of reservation for the absent or sick, the ordering of the mixed chalice, and the fixing of the minimum number of communicants at one or two.

A modern liturgy of great interest is that of the Catholic Apostolic Church, which took definite ecclesiastical shape in 1835. The present Order for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist (in its fullest form) reminds us of the stately ritual of the Eastern Church. Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation are repudiated by the Church now referred to, but a strong doctrine of the mystical Presence is maintained. A description of the progress of this Service would too much resemble a

repetition of what has been given under the Greek, Roman, and Anglican heads. A few characteristics, however, deserve mention. The fulness of the ritual as a whole and the richness of the prayers severally are quite exceptional. There is no Mariolatry or saint-worship, but there are prayers for the dead, and incense is employed. The writer was recently impressed by the unusual heartiness with which a London congregation fulfilled the numerous responses assigned to it.

A specimen of a Communion Service of a Congregational Church may be taken from the Devotional Services prepared by Dr. John Hunter, Glasgow. First, the minister, standing by the Table, says one or more of a number of Scripture sentences, and adds a Collect for cleansing. Heber's hymn, "Bread of the world, in mercy broken," is then sung. Selections from Scripture are read, together with the Commandments, each Commandment being received by the people with a response. After a brief pause for silent meditation, the minister reads a series of devout prayers. The salient verses of the Institution from 1 Cor. are quoted. Then the minister delivers the Bread, saying, "Take and eat this in remembrance of Christ"; and the Cup, saying, "Drink this in remembrance of Christ." The offering or alms is taken, and after a hymn and the

Lord's Prayer (repeated by the congregation) the benediction is pronounced.

Not unlike the preceding is the Order in Common Prayer for Christian Worship,[1] a manual not professedly Unitarian, but really so. Scripture sentences and an opening Address are followed by penitential prayers for acceptance. To the narrative from 1 Cor. are at once added words of delivery identical with Dr. Hunter's, these being given as alternative: —"As a solemn testimony, in the presence of each other and before God, of our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, let us take and eat of this bread [and again, drink of this cup] in remembrance of Him." A passage from John xvii. is read after the participation. A belated Sursum Corda then occurs, also a truncated Gloria in Excelsis. An Intercessory Prayer is next given, although it may be waived in favour of another form of the Gloria in Excelsis coupled with a prayer for acceptance of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and of self-consecration. A final hymn is succeded by this benediction, "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep our hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

[1] London: Whitefield, 1886.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SACRAMENT IN DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE

IN the course of Christian centuries a vast pile of volumes has accumulated itself around the subject of the Lord's Supper. Our references to the literature of the subject having been chiefly of a kind bearing upon doctrine, a chapter dealing with some representative devotional writings upon the Sacrament may appropriately be included in our treatise.

Theology at its best is supremely devotional; nor is there any better food for piety than the works of the great doctors of that queen of sciences. It is not, however, to the masterpieces of controversy that we shall now have much recourse, but rather to writings of a more purely religious spirit.

Patristic literature, so much studied in the interests of schools and parties, is rich in treasures of spiritual beauty. The golden-mouthed preacher of Constantinople is nowhere more eloquent than

upon the theme of the Supper. Let us string together a few of St. Chrysostom's pearls.

"O marvel! O love of God for man! He who sitteth aloft with the Father is at the hour of Communion held in the hands of all, and giveth Himself to those who will, to enfold and to embrace. But this they do with the eye of faith. Dost thou not straightway remove to Heaven, and casting forth from thy soul every carnal thought, with bared soul and pure mind, survey the things of Heaven? The soul which receiveth such a Spirit, what should be so pure and holy? Do thou then approach, bringing gifts not such as the Magi brought, but much holier. They brought gold; bring thou sobriety and virtue: they brought frankincense; bring thou pure prayers, spiritual incense: they brought myrrh; do thou bring lowliness of mind, and a humbled heart and alms. The Magi went forth from Persia: do thou go forth from the cares of this life and journey to Jesus. It is not necessary to cross the seas, nor to traverse mountain-top; but sitting at home, displaying reverence and much compunction, thou canst see Him, thou canst destroy the whole partition-wall, remove the hindrance, shorten the length of the journey. Communion is a pure conscience and a life freed from sin. Hasten to Bethlehem, where is the House of Spiritual

Bread. For though thou be a shepherd and come hither, thou wilt behold the young Child in an inn: though thou be a king, and come not hither, thy purple robe will profit thee nothing: though thou be one of the wise men, this will be no hindrance to thee. Only let thy coming be to honour and adore; only do this with trembling and joy. Know ye not that this Table is full of spiritual fire: and as fountains gush forth with the nature of water, so this too hath a certain ineffable fire.

"This Blood causeth the image of our King to be fresh within us, produceth beauty unspeakable, permitteth not the nobleness of our souls to waste away, watering it and nourishing it continually. This Blood is the salvation of our souls, by this the soul is washed, by this is beautified, by this inflamed. This causeth our understanding to be more bright than fire, and our soul more beaming than gold; this Blood was poured forth and made Heaven accessible. Awful in truth are the Mysteries of the Church, awful in truth is the Altar. Hast thou heard holy hymns? Hast thou seen a spiritual marriage? Hast thou enjoyed a royal Table? Hast thou been filled with the Holy Ghost? Hast thou joined in the quire of the Seraphim? Hast thou become partaker of the powers above? Cast not away so great a joy, waste not the treasure, bring not in drunkenness, the

mother of dejection, the joy of the devil, the parent of ten thousand evils. He who draws nigh to this Body must be like the eagles on high, and have nothing in common with the earth, nor wind himself downwards and creep along; but must ever be soaring heavenwards, and look on the Sun of Righteousness and have the eye of his mind quick-sighted!"

St. Augustine's fervour in Communion, though expressed in less glowing imagery, is not less profound, as the following strain may show:—

"O remember, dearly beloved, how the Lord Jesus willed to be known in the breaking of bread by those whose eyes were holden that they should not know Him! The faithful know what I mean: they know Christ in breaking of bread. See, my brethren, where the Lord would be known. In breaking of bread, we are safe: we break bread, and we know the Lord. Whoever then of you is of the faithful, whoever art not idly called a Christian, who dost not enter a church without cause, hearest the Word of God with fear and hope, let the breaking of bread comfort thee. The absence of the Lord is not absence: have faith, and He is with thee whom thou seest not.

"The lowliness of penitence hath been scattered wide and plentifully for this purpose, that the Lord, who resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the

humble, might be the Mediator between God and men, giving Himself to them as food through the Sacrament of His own Body and Blood. We have heard the True Master, the Divine Redeemer, the Human Saviour, commending to us our Ransom, His Blood. He called His Body meat, His Blood drink. But He instructed them and said, 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth. Understand spiritually what I have said: Ye are not to eat this Body which ye see; nor to drink that Blood which they who crucify Me shall pour forth. I have commended unto you a certain mystery; spiritually understood, it will quicken. Although it is needful that this be visibly celebrated, yet it must be spiritually understood. 'O magnify the Lord our God, and fall down before His footstool: for He is holy.' O Sacrament of piety! O sign of unity! O bond of charity! Whoso would live, hath where to live, hath whereof to live. Let him come, let him believe; let him be incorporated that he may be quickened; let him cleave to the Body; let him live to God by God; let him now labour on earth that thereafter they may reign in heaven!"

Coming next to the Middle Ages, and looking for some representation of "all that is elevating, passionate, profoundly pious"[1] in mediævalism, we

[1] Dean Milman.

turn naturally to the *De Imitatione Christi* of Thomas à Kempis, the entire fourth book of which immortal treatise is entitled "Concerning the Communion." Without needless transcription from so familiar a volume, we shall note some Eucharistic traits. In reading such a work belonging to the fifteenth century, we are not surprised to find that the theory of the Sacrament reflects the current ecclesiastical opinion. What might rather surprise us is the small degree in which the scholastic theory peeps forth. This saintly soul is in true communion with Jesus, and it is the Lord Himself rather than the Rite as such that occupies his thoughts. References to the Sacrament as a sacrifice—"in many places Christ is offered"—are rare, and the Presence of Christ is much more often spoken of as being in the heart of the communicant than in the Elements. It is to all worthy and devout receivers that the Saviour comes. Firm faith, devout hope, sincere charity, humble penitence, fervent prayer, are the great requisites. The whole action is viewed not so much as something performed towards God, but rather as a means of receiving something from God. Here is a Banquet which God of His goodness has prepared; and Jesus is present as the Lord of the Feast. The Supper is, indeed, a precious memorial of the Saviour's death, but the Christ of the

Supper is not contemplated as He is carven on the crucifix, the emblem of the Mass, but rather as a living Friend who comes to meet us in mystical communion. Surely the very voice of Jesus has never been so tenderly and truly echoed as in those His addresses to the soul which occur throughout this book. Surely the believer's ardent longing for fellowship with the Lord has never been so intimately and passionately expressed as in the contrite, affectionate, and adoring supplications embodied here. And the all-sufficiency of Christ Himself, without any sacramental medium, could not be more clearly affirmed than in these sentences following: "Any devout person may every day and every hour profitably and without let draw near to Christ in spiritual communion. For he communicateth mystically and is invisibly refreshed, as often as he devoutly calleth to mind the mystery of the incarnation and passion of Christ, and is inflamed with the love of Him."[1]

The period of the Reformation was more fruitful in doctrinal controversy than in devout meditation.

Luther's writings, however, abound in many purely devotional passages upon the Lord's Supper. To the closing years of the sixteenth century belongs the name of Robert Bruce, the Edinburgh minister,

[1] Bk. iv. chap. xi.

whose sermons on the Sacrament are still so readable and edifying. In the admirable edition by Professor Laidlaw, the language has been modernised. We give a passage as it stands in an earlier edition:

"We get na uther nor na new thing in the sacrament but the same thing quhilk we gat in the Word. . . . But suppose it be sa, yit the sacrament is not superfluous. But would thou understand quhat new thing thou gets, quhat uther thing thou gets? I will tell thee. Suppose thou get that same thing quhilk thou gat in the Word, yit thou gets that same thing better; quhat is that better? Thou gets a better grip of that same thing in the sacrament than thou gat be the hearing of the Word. That same thing quhilk thou possessed be the hearing of the Word, thou possessest now mair largely; he hes a greiter bounds in thy saull be the receaving of the sacrament, nor utherways he could have be the hearing of the word onelie. Then speers thou, quhat new thing we get? I say we get this new thing,—we get Christ better nor we did before; we get the thing that we got mair fullie, that is, with a surer apprehension nor we had of before; we get a better grip of Christ now: For be the sacrament my faith is nourished, the bounds of my saull is enlarged, and sa, quhere I had but a little grip of Christ before, as it were betwixt my finger

and my thumbe, now I get Him in my haill hande."[1]

By the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Lancelot Andrewes was in his prime, Protestant theology was well defined. Andrewes' *Private Devotions* contain some Communion Prayers and Meditations which, though not great in quantity, deserve mention here. After an act of self-examination before the Lord's Supper, comes a most beautiful anticipatory prayer, from which we take these petitions: "We, the ruined, wretched, and excessive sinner, deign to receive to the touch and the partaking of the immaculate, supernatural, life-giving and saving mysteries of Thy all-holy body and Thy precious blood." "Come Thou to sanctify the gifts which lie before Thee, and those in whose behalf, and by whom, and the things for which, they are brought near Thee. And grant to us communion unto faith without shame, . . . that we may become partakers of Thy undefiled and everlasting goods." During Communion it is besought "that we receiving in the pure testimony of our conscience our portion of Thy sacred things, may be made one with the holy Body and Blood of Thy Christ; and, receiving them not unworthily, may

[1] *Sermons*, by Mr. Robert Bruce. Edinburgh, 1590. Wodrow Society's edition.

hold Christ in our hearts, and may become a temple of Thy Holy Spirit; nor make any of us guilty of these Thy dread and heavenly mysteries." The prayer after Communion runs thus: "Fulfilled and finished, so far as in our power, O Christ our God, is the mystery of Thy dispensation. For we have held remembrance of Thy death, we have seen the figure of Thy resurrection, we have been filled with Thy endless life, we have enjoyed Thy uncloying dainties, of which vouchsafe unto all of us to be accounted worthy also in the world to come." In a Meditation during and after the Supper we have a collection of suggestive phrases descriptive of the Sacrament. It is a token of fellowship, a sharing in the spirit, rest of conscience, cleansing of stains, healing of the soul's sicknesses, renewing of the covenant, liveliness of thanksgiving, mutual indwelling, pledge of resurrection, acceptable defence in judgment, etc. etc.

Four years after Andrewes' death, George Herbert became rector of Bemerton, where he wrote *A Priest to the Temple.* From chapter xxii., headed "The Parson in Sacraments," we take a few sentences:

"The Country Parson being to administer the Sacraments, is at a stand with himself how or what behaviour to assume for so holy things. Especially at Communion times he is in a great confusion, as

being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him. Neither finds he any issue in this but to throw himself down at the throne of grace, saying, 'Lord, Thou knowest what Thou didst when Thou appointedst it to be done thus: therefore do Thou fulfil what Thou dost appoint; for Thou art not only the feast, but the way to it.'"

"The time of every one's first receiving is not so much by years as by understanding; particularly the rule may be this: When any one can distinguish the Sacramental from common bread, knowing the institution and the difference, he ought to receive, of what age soever. Children and youths are usually deferred too long under pretence of devotion to the Sacrament, but it is for want of instruction; their understandings being ripe enough for ill things, and why not then for better?"

Herbert's series of poems, entitled *The Temple*, contains a number of pieces upon the Sacrament, such as "Holy Communion," "The Invitation," "The Banquet." "Holy Communion" may be partially quoted:

"Not in rich furniture or fine array,
Not in a wedge of gold,
Thou who for me wast sold,
To me dost now Thyself convey;
For so Thou shouldst without me still have been,
Leaving within me sin.

But by the way of nourishment and strength,
Thou creepst into my breast;
Making Thy way my rest,
And Thy small quantities my length,
Which spread their forces into every part,
Meeting sin's force and art.

Only Thy grace, which with these elements comes,
Knoweth the ready way,
And hath the privy key,
Opening the soul's most subtle rooms;
While those to spirits refined, at door attend
Despatches from their friend."

But after the middle of the seventeenth century Protestant theology had become fully defined, and the conflicts belonging to the age of Bunyan and Taylor were largely concerned with matters of civil and ecclesiastical tolerance. The former of those master-writers yields a little, the latter much, devotional material concerning the Sacrament.

Bunyan may be said to introduce the Supper into both parts of his priceless allegory, *The Pilgrim's Progress*. The stately palace Beautiful, which stood just by the highway side, represents nothing so truly as the royal Banqueting-House of the Sacrament. The Lions in the path, Mistrust and Timorous, are those which keep many a Christian from approaching the Communion Table. "This house," said the Porter, "was built by the Lord of the hill for the relief and security of pilgrims." The Porter's name, Watchful, indicates

the care necessary in the admission of guests. The virgins within who receive the Pilgrim, namely, Discretion, Prudence, Piety, and Charity, typify some of the Church's duties in receiving guests. Supper must be preceded by some particular discourse with Christian. Evangelist, Interpreter, the Cross, the Sealed Roll, are the proper preparatives for reaching the House. Simple, Sloth, Presumption, Formality, and Hypocrisy, all of whom Christian said he had left behind him, never reach the Palace; and had they reached it, would not have been admitted. The examination of Christian brings out much that is to be desired of a communicant. From the country of which he now thinks with shame and detestation, he bears away, it is true, some of the things he was then conversant withal, especially certain inward carnal cogitations; but it is greatly against his will, for these things are now his grief, and he would choose to think of them no more, and the hours in which they are vanquished are golden hours to him. The Cross, the Roll, and the vision of Mount Zion are the means whereby he vanquishes them. His weariness of his inward sickness is a great claim upon the kindness of the House. Although a married man and unhappily arrived thither alone, he declares that he did his best to bring his family with him.

He cannot commend his life; he is conscious of many failings therein, and admits that his faults may have helped to hinder his family from accompanying him; yet he was not without tenderness in sinning against God, or of doing any wrong to his neighbour.

"Now I saw in my dream, that thus they sat talking together until supper was ready. So when they had made ready, they sat down to meat. Now the table was furnished 'with fat things, and with wine that was well refined'; and all their talk at the table was about the Lord of the hill; as, namely, about what he had done, and wherefore he did what he did, and why he had builded that house. . . . Thus they discoursed together till late at night; and after they had committed themselves to their Lord for protection, they betook themselves to rest: the pilgrim they laid in *a large upper chamber* whose window opened towards the sun-rising: the name of the chamber was Peace; where he slept till break of day, and then he awoke and sang:

> 'Where am I now? Is this the love and care
> Of Jesus for the men that pilgrims are?
> Thus to provide! that I should be forgiven!
> And dwell already the next door to heaven!'"

It is not only in the House Beautiful that the same kind of meal is afforded to pilgrims.[1] The house

[1] Part II.

of the Interpreter is no less hospitable, as Christiana and her companions found. While supper is being prepared, the Interpreter shows and tells them of things that are profitable.

"Now supper was ready, the table spread, and all things set on the board; so they sat down and did eat, when one had given thanks. And the Interpreter did usually entertain those that lodged with him with music at meals; so the minstrels played. There was also one that did sing, and a very fine voice he had. His song was this:

'The Lord is only my support,
And He that doth me feed;
How can I then want anything
Whereof I stand in need?'"

At the House Beautiful these later pilgrims are entertained, as Christian had been, ere they went to rest. "'Nay,' said those of the family, 'refresh yourselves first with a morsel of meat'; for they had prepared a lamb, with the accustomed sauce belonging thereto. . . . So when they had supped, and ended their prayer with a psalm, they desired to go to rest.

"*Mercy.* Hark! Don't you hear a noise?

"*Christian.* Yes; 'tis, I believe, a noise of music, for joy that we are here.

"*Mercy.* Wonderful! music in the house, music

in the heart, and music also in heaven, for joy that we are here!"

Some four or five years after the date of Bunyan's great work, Jeremy Taylor finished his treatise, entitled *The Worthy Communicant; or, a Discourse on the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper.* This very full and edifying treatment of the subject contains seven chapters on the following heads respectively: — the nature of the Supper, general preparation to reception, necessity of faith, of charity, and of repentance, actual and ornamental preparation, and comportment in and after reception. To each chapter is added some suitable meditation, devotion, penitential soliloquy, ejaculation, exercise, or advice. Selection from so rich a treasury is difficult, but here are some specimen counsels:

"When you awake on the morning of your communion day, give God thanks particularly that He hath blessed thee with so blessed an opportunity of receiving the symbols of pardon, the ministry of the Spirit, the sacrament of Christ Himself, the seed of immortality, and the antepast of heaven; and hasten earlier out of your bed: the cock crowing that morning is like the noise that is made of the coming of the bridegroom; and therefore go out to meet

Him, but rise that you may trim your lamp, make a general confession of your sins, and be very much humbled in the sense and apprehension of them. 'Worship Jesus'; love Him; dedicate thyself to Him; recollect what He hath done for thy soul: what mysteries He hath appointed: by what ministries He conveys Himself to thee. When thou seest the holy man minister, dispute no more, enquire no more, doubt no more, be divided no more; but believe, and behold with the eyes of faith and of the spirit, that thou seest Christ's body broken upon the cross; that thou seest Him bleeding for thy sins; that thou feedest upon the food of elect souls; that thou puttest thy mouth to the hole of the rock that was smitten, to the wound of the side of thy Lord, which being pierced streamed forth sacraments, and life and holiness, and pardon and purity and immortality upon thee. When thou dost receive thy Lord, do thou also receive thy brother into thy heart. After you have given thanks and finished your private and the public devotions, go home; but do not presently forget the solemnity, and sink from the sublimity of devotion and mystery into a secular conversation, like a falling star from brightness into dirt. But what we do by devotion and solemn religion that day, we must do every day, by material practice of virtues."

We give a characteristic prayer. "O mysterious God, ineffable and glorious majesty; what is this that Thou hast done to the sons of men? Thou hast from Thy bosom sent Thy Son to take upon Him our nature; in Him Thou hast opened the fountains of Thy mercy, and hast invited all penitent sinners to come to be pardoned, all the oppressed to be eased, all the sorrowful to be comforted, all the sick to be cured, all the hungry to be filled, and the thirsty to be refreshed with the waters of life, and sustained with the wine of elect souls. Admit me, O God, to this great effusion of Thy loving-kindness, that I may partake of the Lord Jesus; that by Him I may be comforted in all my griefs, satisfied in all my doubts, healed of the wounds of my soul and the bruises of my spirit, and being filled with the bread of heaven and armed with the strength of the Spirit, I may begin, continue, and finish my journey through this valley of tears, unto my portion of Thy heavenly kingdom, whither our Lord is gone to prepare a place for every loving and obedient soul. Grant this, O eternal God, for His sake who died for us, and intercedes for us, and gives Himself daily to us, our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus. Amen."

The *Worthy Communicant* is to some extent an expansion of what Taylor had written upon the Sacrament in his *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*.

The tenth section of chapter four of *Holy Living* is upon preparation to and the manner how to receive the holy Sacrament, and the effects and benefits of worthy communicating. In the chapter of *Holy Dying*, dealing with the visitation of the sick, the author affirms it to be the minister's office to invite sick and dying persons to the holy Sacrament. But he adds this caution: "Let not the holy sacrament be administered to dying persons, when they have no use or reason to make that duty acceptable, and the mysteries effective to the purposes of the soul. For the sacraments and ceremonies of the Gospel operate not without the concurrent actions and moral influences of the suscipient."

The eighteenth century, so generally dry in devotional feeling, yields very little for our present purpose. Jonathan Edwards's *Inquiry concerning Qualifications for Communion* and his *Misrepresentations Corrected* are valuable works bearing upon practical piety in relation to the Lord's Table. Church members should be visible saints, and their profession should be one of real piety. But since the wheat and tares grow together, care must be exercised in debarring from Communion lest unwarrantable exclusions should be made. Edwards's chief aim is to oppose promiscuous admission to the Lord's Table. "And now is it not better to have a

few real living Christians kept back through darkness and scruples, than to open a door for letting in such a universal ruin as this?" To illustrate it by a familiar comparison: Is it not better, when England is at war with France, to keep out of the British realm a few loyal Englishmen, than to give leave for as many treacherous Frenchmen to come in as please?

While these treatises contain much that is searching and salutary, they are marked by that excessive austerity which went so far to weaken his later influence as to necessitate the resignation of his ministry in 1750.

The prayers before Communion, composed by Dr. Samuel Johnson (who died in 1783), are noteworthy for their simple, vigorous, and devout spirit.

In the opening years of the nineteenth century, little was written of a specifically sacramental kind. In his Notes on the Prayer-Book, Coleridge, having quoted a statement that ere coming to Communion we must not only see our sins, but also hate them, adds this: "But what if a man, seeing his sin, earnestly desire to hate it? Shall he not at the altar offer up at once his desire, and the yet lingering sin, and seek for strength? Is not this sacrament medicine as well as food? Is it an end only, and not likewise the means? Is it merely

a triumphal feast; or is it not even more truly a blessed refreshment for and during the conflict?"

Of the Oxford School, so fertile in literature upon our subject, the first name to attract our attention is that of Keble, who did so much to foster the devotional spirit. From the *Christian Year* a few lines (besides those taken above from the poem on "Holy Communion") may be cited from the poem on "Communion of the Sick":

> "I came again: the place was bright
> 'With something of celestial light'—
> A simple altar by the bed
> For high Communion meetly spread,
> Chalice and plate and snowy vest.—
> We ate and drank: then calmly blest,
> All mourners, one with dying breath,
> We sate and talk'd of Jesus' death."

From Keble's *Eucharistic Adoration* we make a short extract. "This memorial Christ offers in Heaven, night and day, to God the Father: His glorified Body, with all its wounds, His Blood which He poured out upon the Cross, but on His Resurrection took again to Himself, and with it ascended into Heaven. With that Body and Blood He appears continually before the throne, by it making intercession for us; by it reminding God the Father of His one oblation of Himself, once offered upon the Cross, as St. John writes, 'We have an Advocate,'

one to plead for us, 'with the Father, and He is the Propitiation for our sins!' Thus He is our Aaron first and then our Melchizedec, the virtue of His perpetual Advocacy depending on His former Propitiation."

J. H. Newman's prose writings, so rich in flights of spiritual eloquence, are sufficiently familiar. In his less frequently read Verses on Various Occasions we find these lines:

"THE PRIESTLY OFFICE

"In service o'er the Mystic Feast I stand;
I cleanse Thy victim-flock and bring them near
In holiest wise, and by a bloodless rite.
O fire of Love! O gushing Fount of Light!
(As best I know, who need Thy pitying Hand)
Dread office this, bemired souls to clear
Of their defilement, and again make bright." (cxvi.)

Perhaps no sermons of the Oxford School so powerfully press home sacramental doctrine as those preached by H. E. Manning while Archdeacon of Chichester. His subsequent transition to Rome should no more blind us to the beauty of his Protestant sermons, than the similar fact in Newman's case blinds us to the excellencies of his *Parochial Sermons*. The rarity of copies of these discourses by Manning leads us to draw attention to them, especially to the fourth volume, which contains Eucharistic sermons with such titles as the following:

"The Body of Christ," "The only Sacrifice," "The Feast of the Old Creation and the New," "The Passover greatly Desired," "Worthy Communion," "Communion with Christ." From one of these we reproduce the conclusion:[1]

"O cold and constrained hearts, who draw near only because He has commanded! O close and calculating souls, who come only because it is for their advantage! Hard and perishing are they who have cause to be afraid to come; unbelieving and ungrateful, who without cause turn their backs upon His desire. On earth, 'He was despised and rejected of men.' So is He now. . . . If any dying friend, in the night of his last agony, should say, 'Day by day kneel down at noon and remember me,' love would constrain us to fulfil it. The known desire of one loved and departed is among the most powerful and persuasive motives. If we should forget it for a day, we should be cut to the heart; we should reproach our unstable affections. 'Out of sight, out of mind,' is the world's reproof to heartless friends. How then shall we escape rebuke if we neglect so fervent a desire? Blessed thought that He is drawing us to Himself; that all His will is towards us, and all His heart set upon us, even in the midst of our faults, follies, weakness, inconstancy, and sins. What we are He knows; and yet, such as

[1] "The Passover greatly Desired."

we are, He desires our fellowship, that by communion with Him we may be cleansed and changed; that the altar here may be a preparation and foretaste of the marriage supper in heaven, where with face unveiled He will sit down, and all His saints and all His beloved ones with Him, at the eternal Feast which shall be eaten ever new in the kingdom of God."

To pass from the Oxford writers to C. H. Spurgeon might seem a sharp transition to any one oblivious of the extent to which the Baptist preacher equals them, and in some points surpasses them, in Communion fervour expressed in purest English. Let us take a specimen from a short address to a few friends at Mentone, at the Breaking of Bread on Lord's-Day afternoon, January 2nd, 1887. The text is: "Awake, O north wind; and come, thou south; blow upon my garden, that the spices thereof may flow out. Let my beloved come into his garden, and eat his pleasant fruits." "The soul of the believer is the garden. Within it are rare plants, such as yield 'spices' and 'pleasant fruits.' At times within that garden everything is very still and quiet; indeed, more than could be wished. Flowers are in bloom, but they seem scentless, for there are no breezes to waft the perfume. The soul cries for the breath of heaven to break the dead calm which broods over her heart. 'Awake, O north wind'; though the blast be cold and cutting,

it may be that it will effectually fetch forth the perfume of the soul in the form of repentance and self-humiliation. Yet it may be that the Lord will send something more tender and cheering. 'Come, thou south.' The prayer of the spouse is—'Let my beloved come.' Let him come into our little circle; let him come into each heart. O my Beloved, let not my sinful, sluggish, wandering thoughts prevent thee from coming! Surely my heart hath great need of thee. Welcome, welcome, welcome! Heaven cannot welcome thee more heartily, O my Beloved, than my heart still now does! Fulfil to us that gracious promise, 'I will sup with him and he with me,' for we do open to thee. Thou saidst unto the woman of Samaria, 'Give me to drink,' and wilt thou not now accept a draught of love from us? Wilt thou not drink from the cup which we now hold to thee? Receive our love, our trust, our consecration. We will now come to thy table, where thou shalt be our meat and drink; but suffer our spices to be the perfume of the feast, and let us each say, 'While the King sitteth at his table, my spikenard sendeth forth the smell thereof!' Fulfil this wish of our soul, divine Lord and Master! Amen."

To the above extracts we cannot forbear adding a paragraph from the Communion Address which concludes Dr. James Martineau's *Hours of Thought*:—

"If we have wandered from the Christ within the soul, this is our time—this is our place of return. Again and again, after every failure, we must come back with contrition, but without despair. Here is the rendezvous of our fidelity; here our communion once more; here the divine Guide, with whose will we are henceforth to harmonise our own. This hour is to be hospitable to the holiest messenger of God; to make ready the guest-chamber in the upper dwelling of our hearts; and to shut out, amid the converse of blessed thoughts, the voices of men and the threatenings of sorrow. Let pure and perfect trust fill all the room; let the Judas-element in our soul rise and quickly pass into the night; and the love that remains rest there, with freer surrender, upon the form of heavenly sanctity."

An unconventional "Address before Communion" is given in the Appendix of Professor Henry Drummond's *Life*.[1] It was one of those given to students of Edinburgh University. The subject is the Bread of Life. "Gentlemen," it begins, "I am glad that this series of meetings is to close by our sitting down together at the Lord's Supper. Because it is one of the many things that bring into our memories the necessity of living upon Christ." Then the speaker goes on to deal with the problem of Nutrition in connection with the

[1] *The Life of Henry Drummond*, by G. A. Smith, p. 493.

Christian life, and illustrates his message with skilful biological analogies.

Poetry (apart from hymnody) yields surprisingly little concerning our theme. In his *Ecclesiastical Sonnets*, Wordsworth preceded Keble in the composition of a poetical commentary upon the principal contents of the Prayer-Book. Thus, after two sonnets upon Confirmation, we have one entitled "Sacrament."

> "By chain yet stronger must the soul be tied:
> One duty more, last stage of this ascent,
> Brings to thy food, mysterious Sacrament!
> The Offspring haply at the Parents' side;
> But not till they, with all that do abide
> In Heaven, have lifted up their hearts to laud
> And magnify the glorious name of God,
> Fountain of grace, whose Son for sinners died,
> Ye, who have duly weighed the summons, pause
> No longer; ye, whom to the saving Rite
> The Altar calls, come early under laws
> That can secure for you a path of light
> Through gloomiest shade; put on (nor dread its weight)
> Armour divine, and conquer in your cause!"

"After Communion" is the title of a poem by Christina G. Rosetti, from which the following lines are taken:

> "What wilt Thou call me in our home above
> Who now hast called me friend? how will it be
> When Thou for good wine settest forth the best?
> Now Thou dost bid me come and sup with Thee,
> Now Thou dost make me lean upon Thy breast:
> How will it be with me in time of love?"

Dr. Walter C. Smith, the Scottish poet-preacher, has written some sympathetic lines of intercession in behalf of different classes of communicants:

"If any to the Feast have come
Who were not bidden, Lord forgive!
They were not of our Father's Home,
Yet in Thy mercy let them live.

If any came in doubt and fear,
O! let them carry peace away!
Let Heaven to them be calm and clear,
Still brightening to the perfect day!

And who in Zion mourning were,
O give them songs of praise to Thee;
And who were full of anxious care,
Lord, set them from their burden free.

All those who never sat before,
At this dear altar of Thy grace,
O may they love Thee more and more,
And serve Thee in Thy holy place.

And those who ne'er again shall see
The day of our Communion dawn,
Prepare them, Lord, to feast with Thee
At tables which are never drawn.

Forgive us all our wandering thoughts,
Our little love, our feeble faith,
And may we meet, our battle fought,
Beyond the realms of sin and death!"

The amount of Eucharistic hymnody is considerable. At primitive gatherings for the breaking of bread, certain contributors to the proceedings would bring a hymn of their "own composing." The fame of the Syrian St. Ephrem rests largely

upon his hymns, of which we give a specimen, whether it was composed originally in Syriac or Greek being doubtful:

> "Call with Thy voice commandingly:
> And let us rise lightly;
> Who eat Thy Body gloriously,
> And drink Thy Blood purely;
> And when Thou comest swiftly
> In the glory of the Angels terribly,
> We will enter with Thee collectively,
> To dwell with Thee joyously."

It is, however, from Latin *hymnaria* that most extant Sacramental hymns are drawn, many of which are so familiar as to require no particular reference. Some of them, translated by Neale, appear in the chief English and Scottish collections. Of English hymn-writers, in connection with the Communion, Doddridge, J. Wesley, Bright, and Bonar are eminent. A hymn by Wesley, which appears in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, might with advantage have been included in other collections, such as *The Church Hymnary*. It begins:

> "Author of life Divine,
> Who hast a Table spread,
> Furnished with mystic Wine
> And everlasting Bread,
> Preserve the life Thyself hast given,
> And feed and train us up for heaven."

The freedom of song as compared with dogmatic statement is seen in such lines of Wesley as these:

"With solemn faith we offer up,
And spread before Thy Glorious eyes,
The only ground of all our hope,
That precious Bleeding Sacrifice,
Which brings Thy Grace on sinners down,
And perfects all our souls in one."

"By faith we see Thy Sufferings past
In this mysterious rite brought back,
And on Thy grand Oblation cast,
Its saving benefit partake."

The metrical paraphrase of Matt. xxvi. 26–29, beginning, "'Twas on that night, when doomed to know," is hallowed by long and general use at Scotch Communions. Its author is thought to be a certain J. Morison.

The vast body of devotional literature belonging to the Lord's Supper forms an impressive testimony to the unique place which the Sacrament occupies in the Christian heart. What fundamental unity of feeling in this respect prevails in different ages, churches, and individual minds! The Lord's Table shares the honour of the Cross as a rallying point for Christians redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. May the Holy Spirit of Truth, Love, and Peace more and more dispel every cause of division, till we all come in the unity of the faith to perfect oneness in the fellowship of Christ's Body and Blood!

CHAPTER XIV

PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE

AS every Christian doctrine has its counterpart in practice, so there are many important points at which the doctrine of the Lord's Supper touches individual and corporate life.

To begin with infancy, the Christian child being the offspring of persons presumably in union and communion with Jesus Christ, the christening of the child at once foreshadows, and indeed directly points forward to the fuller communion to be one day enjoyed in the subsequent Sacrament. The young life is baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and, controversy about baptismal regeneration apart, and without any approach to mechanical or magical sacramentalism, the child of Christian parents may be reasonably said to be born again in this sense at least that his birth is not a birth into a *milieu* of the merely natural order, but into a set of circumstances profoundly modified by the Christian standing of

his parents, and by the fact of a domestic and churchly atmosphere more or less perfumed by the presence of the Spirit of Christ. Formally at least, and (let us hope) in most cases really, the child becomes a member of the Church, which is the body of Christ. "The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, consists of all those who throughout the world profess the true religion, *together with their children;* and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God."[1] The child is baptized in the hope that he may be "received into Christ's holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same."[2] Certainly he becomes a member of a society touched to some extent by the influences of Christianity. The child has a covenant relation more or less fruitful hereafter.

Now the Cup of the Lord's Supper is the New Covenant in His blood. That blood has been shed for humanity, as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and as an antidote to original sin. Christian infants, therefore, the children of the first Adam in the course of nature, are now ideally children of the New Covenant, and this implies a relationship in embryo to the Cup of the Cove-

[1] *Westminster Confession*, chap. xxv. 1.
[2] *Common Prayer*—"The Public Baptism of Infants."

nant. That Cup is theirs in principle, and ought to become theirs in fact, so soon as they reach sufficient self-consciousness, and unless their initial privileges somehow miscarry. Therefore amongst the holy ambitions to be set before the Christian parent, that of looking prayerfully and helpfully forward to the child becoming a member of Christ's body in full communion ought ever to be a salient one.

Supposing, then, that the prayers offered at a child's baptism are graciously answered, he will grow into the knowledge and love of Jesus as the bud opening into bloom turns ever more towards the cherishing sun; and the question as to the age at which he may communicate in the Supper presently arises. On this point the New Testament gives no explicit direction. In the Jewish Passover the whole family participated, and it was the children who were to ask, "What mean ye by this service?"[1] It was at twelve years of age that Jesus accompanied His parents to the great feast at Jerusalem. Children, it is interesting though not decisive to remember, were present at Christ's feeding of the multitude, when He proffered Himself as the Bread of Life. At length in the early Christian Church child-communion came to prevail.

[1] Ex. xii. 26.

The *Apostolical Constitutions* (which carry us back to a period earlier than their own date) prescribe the following order: — "After this let the Bishop partake, then the Presbyters and the Deacons, and subdeacons and readers, and singers, and the Ascetics; and among the women the Deaconesses, and the Virgins and Widows; after them *the children*, and then all the people in order, with modesty and reverence, and without noise."[1]

The practice common at an early period in the Eastern and African Churches of giving the communion to baptized infants "shows the magical character which the Eucharist had assumed."[2]

In the Greek and Oriental Churches this custom is still maintained. "Even infants, from the very time of their baptism, partake as often as their parents desire it."[3] In the West it fell away gradually,[4] and was finally forbidden by Pope Innocent, lest the Host should be profaned in the event of portions being let fall by children.

In England in the year 1565 we find Bishop Bentham charging the clergy to make presentments of all children being full seven years of age[5] "for Confirmation." Later practice follows Cosin's recom-

[1] Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 49.
[2] *Christianity and the Roman Empire*, by W. E. Addis, p. 180.
[3] Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 49. [4] *Ibid.*
[5] *Ibid.* p. 46.

mendation of the age of sixteen. "But it may very well be doubted," adds the Rev. W. E. Scudamore, "whether the modern practice is the best. Were persons confirmed at an earlier age than they usually are now, and after a suitable interval carefully prepared for their first Communion, it is reasonable to think that there would be far less neglect of that Sacrament. . . . Abstractedly there is no reason why children should not be admitted to Holy Communion at a very early age."[1] We have seen George Herbert's view that children and youths are usually deferred too long,[2] and Wordsworth's call to come early to the saving Rite.[3]

In Scotland there is no ecclesiastical prescription as to the age for first Communion. John Knox, while minister of St. Giles's, Edinburgh, admitted a boy of ten. The average age at present is too late. Of great weight as coming from a professor of moral philosophy and a modern specialist in education is the opinion of Dr. Coe of America, to the effect that after careful investigation and revision of his earlier opinion, he would seek for "young communicants" in the early teens.[4]

[1] *Notitia Euch.* p. 48. [2] Page 237, *sup.* [3] Page 253, *sup.*
[4] *Education in Religion and Morals*, by George Albert Coe, Ph.D., p. 254. 1904.

Acting then upon the importance of timely Communion, parents, guardians, teachers, and pastors will do well to bring this duty before the minds of youths and maidens in the most judicious and responsible way. A natural expectation that the time for approaching the Lord's Table, for "Confirmation" or "joining the Church," has arrived may afford a precious opportunity and an unforced opening for spiritual conversation of the most pregnant kind. The question of the Sacrament will lead to that of the Lord of the Sacrament. Early faith may thus become confirmed, ere "the world grows thick and bad, and he feels out for virtue." Or a crucial and much needed conversion may be the happy result. As against the risk that young people may thus be induced to become candidates for Communion without sufficient prompture of sincerity and earnestness, it is probable that the perils of procrastination on the part of the timid, the over-scrupulous, the imperfectly informed, and the generally unshepherded, are infinitely more serious.

At all events, with whatever safety or risk invitations to the Lord's Table may be given to young men and women as a whole, there are certain classes of them whose absence from the Sacrament may justly occasion surprise. The work of Sunday-school

teachers, members of choirs, collectors, indeed any activity spoken of as Christian work, ought to imply a sufficiency of Christian faith and life to warrant participation in the Lord's Supper. Membership, likewise, in Church Guilds, Young Men's and Women's Christian Associations, Christian Endeavour Societies, and the like, involves an amount of Christian profession which *pari passu* ought to ensure application for the Sacrament.

Passing now to some of the obstacles which prevent various classes of people from becoming communicants, the principal as it is also the most radical and obvious is a lack of living faith in Christ and of real aspiration after fellowship with Him. But besides this there are in the case of many who are not without true faith in Christ a multitude of minor impediments capable of removal by a right understanding of the doctrine of the Supper in its personal applications.

Nothing is more important than to obviate any unduly terrorising effect of the words in the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians about communicating "unworthily," and thus "eating and drinking damnation" to one's self. The substitution, in the Revised Version, of "judgment" for "damnation" is an advantage. Still clearer is the translation given in the excellent *Twentieth Century New*

Testament:[1]—"Therefore whoever eats the bread, or drinks the cup, in an irreverent spirit, will have to answer for an offence against the Lord's body and blood. Let each man look into his own heart, and only then let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For the man who eats and drinks brings a judgment on himself by his eating and drinking, when he does not discern the Lord's body."

The true interpretation of this passage cannot be more lucidly and helpfully expressed than in the words of Calvin, who in such a question of spiritual casuistry will not be suspected of leaning to the side of laxity. "In seeking to prepare for eating worthily," he writes, "men have often dreadfully harassed and tortured miserable consciences, and yet have in no degree attained the end. They have said that those eat worthily who are in a state of grace. *Being in a state of grace* they have interpreted to be pure and free from all sin. By this definition all men that ever have been or are upon the earth were debarred from the use of this Sacrament. For if we seek our own worthiness from ourselves, it is all over with us; only despair and fatal ruin await us. Though we struggle to the utmost, we will not only make no

[1] *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, a translation into modern English, made from the original Greek.

progress, but then be most unworthy after we have laboured most to make ourselves worthy."[1] Unworthiness, Calvin goes on to say, cannot be expiated as the Roman Catholics attempt to do by contrition, confession, and satisfaction. "We shall rather consider," he proceeds, "that we who are poor are coming to a benevolent giver, sick to a physician, sinful to the author of righteousness, in fire, dead to him who gives life; that worthiness which is commanded by God consists especially in faith, which places all things in Christ, nothing in ourselves, and in charity which though imperfect it may be sufficient to offer to God, that He may increase it, since it cannot be fully rendered."[2]

The unworthiness rebuked by the Apostle Paul in the case of the Corinthians consisted in a species of sacrilege in connection with the Agapé preceding the Communion. Certain carnal persons exhibited haste in obtaining their share, greed and even drunkenness, a general failure in brotherly consideration, and above all a deplorable indifference to the spiritual significance of a Rite intended to be a means of communion in the Lord's Body. In consequence of the abolition of the Love Feast, little opportunity is now afforded for animal

[1] *Institutes of Religion*, IV. xvii. 41.
[2] *Ibid.* IV. xvii. 42.

intemperance; but the essential sin of an unbelieving, irreverent, undevout, venal or in some wise carnal approach to the Lord's Table is still very possible; and such profanity is still to be censured as an offence against the Lord's Body and Blood for which the offender must answer. Yet even here the condemnation is not necessarily unremissible or fatal, and if the offender's name should be blotted out from the Book of Life, his forfeiture of salvation must be set down as being due rather to that deeper sin of which sacramental irreverence is but a symptom or an incident.

While, therefore, unworthy communicating meets with its own censure, it is not necessarily identical with the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, with which sin it has sometimes been confused. Something like this confusion has been apt to occur in parts of the Scottish Highlands, where a morbid awe of approaching the Lord's Table often results in a very meagre proportion of the flock venturing to communicate at all.

This dread may take the form not so much of a present or retrospective sense of unworthiness, as of an apprehensiveness concerning future inability to walk worthily of Communion privileges and obligations. These privileges and obligations, it is feared, may aggravate the guilt of trespasses

and infirmities otherwise less heinous. For such apprehensiveness there is of course some warrant in the truth that from him to whom much is given, much shall be required, and that it may be better not to vow than to vow and not perform. But are there no countervailing considerations of a reassuring kind? Surely strength is promised to the Christian who fearlessly does the duty that lies nearest to him, in this case the duty of obeying the Lord's command to commemorate Him in the Supper; and a fresh supply of grace is guaranteed for every new responsibility. The Sacrament itself is a means of fresh grace, and may in fact be the very reinforcement needed by one who is apprehensive as to the fickleness of his character and the precariousness of his conduct. Besides, the future swerving is meanwhile problematical, whereas the present fault of omitting to communicate is certain. Should the Christian be betrayed into sin subsequently to partaking in the Sacrament, the forgiveness of God will not be wanting to the contrite heart to-morrow any more than to-day. The warnings in the Epistle to the Hebrews that it is impossible for those who have tasted of the heavenly gift and have fallen away to be renewed again to repentance;[1] and that if after receiving the

[1] Heb. vi. 4.

knowledge of the truth we sin wilfully in treading the Blood of the Covenant underfoot, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins;—these warnings apply to wilful sin as a habit (ἁμαρτανόντων), not to single wilful acts, and to a willing continuance in sin (ἑκουσίως), without inward repugnance or sorrow.[1] But no limits are put to God's forgiveness where there is repentance on man's part. What is seventy times seven compared to the virtue of the Blood of Atonement? The justifying grace of God whereby He accepts the sinner as righteous in His sight has a forward as well as a backward reference. Wrapped up in God's act of justification is the truth of the perseverance of the saints in spite of all lapses or divagations. Nor, finally, does any one escape the essential controversy between God and the soul simply by avoiding the guilt of a subsequent dishonouring of the profession made at the Lord's Table. For that essential controversy concerns the entire fact of the sin and guilt of a man's nature: until *that* is settled, other questions are beside the point; and *when* that is settled, other questions receive their own solution.

Of fears and scruples in general, except such as arise from a certain pure humility and noble modesty, it may be said that their generic spring

[1] Gilbert, *The First Interpreters of Jesus*, p. 295.

is to be found in a lack of religious assurance. Not seldom the lack has been due to difficulty about the doctrine of Election, and to uncertainty about one's place amongst the elect. It will be remembered how much torment this speculation caused John Bunyan, until he found relief in the text, "Look at the generations of old; did any ever trust in the Lord and were confounded?"[1] And there is much excellence in Calvin's recommendation that the mirror in which to see our election is Christ, fellowship with whom is sufficient proof of our election. But although the judgment by the House of Lords in the recent Scottish Church Case has temporarily revived popular interest in the doctrine of Election, the pressure of modern uncertainty as to personal standing in Christ, and as to a personal title to the benefits of the Sacrament, bears at angles different from those reflected, say, in Pascal's *Provincial Letters*, or in the early novels of Dr. George Macdonald, such as *Robert Falconer*.

Modern revivalism, with its striking phenomena of sudden conversion and ecstatic experience, has sometimes the effect of unduly shaking the confidence of Christians who cannot point in their own case to any similar crisis or rapture. It is well for such Christians to remember that in considering their

[1] *Grace Abounding*, p. 35 (Cassell's edition).

title to frequent the Lord's Supper, attention should rather be occupied with Christ Himself than with varieties of religious experience, however genuine.

The admirable answer to interrogations about personal fitness for joining in the Sacrament to be found in the Westminster Larger Catechism is well worth quotation,—"One who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof; and in God's account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ and to depart from iniquity; in which case (because promises are made, and this Sacrament is appointed for the relief even of weak and doubting Christians), he is to bewail his unbelief, and labour to have his doubts removed, and so doing, he may and ought to come to the Lord's Supper, that he may be further strengthened."[1]

A number of further objections to communicating may be briefly met. There are persons who, though satisfied as to the permissibility of their presence at the Sacrament, think it their duty to resile until they have acquired a higher degree of actual saintliness. But is not this as though the insufficiently

[1] Question 172.

nourished in body were to decline the food fitted to strengthen, or as though the sick patient were to decline the physician's prescription? Others of a secretive and solitary disposition, in segregating themselves from fellowship, forswear the very corrective needed in their case. The self-righteous, again, who complain of the questionable character and inconsistent conduct of persons to be seen at the Table, overlook the Lord's parable of the Tares and the Wheat, forget how He Himself ate and drank with publicans and sinners, and how even the communicants in the Upper Room were far from being perfect. The exclusiveness practised by Plymouthists, Baptists of "close communion," and perfectionists in general, implies a defective understanding of the limits of judgment devolving upon ecclesiastical officers. God alone searcheth the heart, and it is certain that the sins of uncharity and pharisaism are not the least inimical to worthy communion. Once more, problems of asceticism and of practical casuistry deter some from committing themselves to the fellowship of the Supper. The perplexed in such matters will do well to study their Bible more than the opinions of ascetics and precisians, who often come under the Apostle's condemnation of teaching the doctrines of men for the commandments of God. While there is no limit

to the holy self-denial open to every communicant, the individual is not to be judged of men, since it is to his own Master that every one standeth or falleth. As for sticklers about details in the manner of administering the Sacrament, they are commonly marked either by lack of devotional fervour or of calm judgment. This not infrequently applies to fastidiousness about the common Cup, resulting in some quarters in the adoption of the individual Cup, to the sacrifice of the dignity of the Chalice, and to some measure of departure from the rubric, "Take this and divide it amongst yourselves."[1] Disputes about the use of fermented wine seem most unhappy and superfluous.

Proceeding next to focus some of the experimental benefits of participation in the Supper, one of the first characteristics to be noted is the expressiveness of the Rite in respect of that fundamental mood of the human spirit called penitence. If penitence be the fundamental Christian grace, if (as Dr. Illingworth has just written[2]) it be that which "places our entire personality, with the triple functions of reason, feeling, and will, in a right relation to God," is it not specially in the Lord's

[1] Luke xxii. 17.

[2] *Christian Character:* being some Lectures on the Elements of Christian Ethics.

Supper that we find this grace evoked and made most fruitful? For the entire Rite is eloquent of the fact of sin, while still more eloquent of the remedy. The true attitude in which every communicant approaches the Sacrament is one of penitent confession,—"We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy Table."[1] And if repentance be not deep enough, as in truth it never is, the vicarious penitence of Him who endured the spiritual cross of man's impenitency is symbolically renewed in the Sacrament of His Passion. Anon, however, contrition becomes merged in the sense of reconciliation by means of the Cup of that Blood once shed for the remission of sins. And here let it be remarked that the denial of the Cup to the laity partly explains that lack of firm assurance concerning the full forgiveness of sins which is a defect of Roman Catholic piety. Surely this denial inflicts a pathetic loss,—a loss not unnoticed by the writer on an occasion when, as he communicated in a Presbyterian pew, and had partaken of the Bread, he was inadvertently overlooked by the elder engaged in administering the Cup. "And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called in one body; and be ye thankful."[2] Peace

[1] *Common Prayer*—"The Communion." [2] Col. iii. 15.

with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the Blood of the Cross, is followed by a deep sense of thankfulness. The Eucharist or Thanksgiving is at once the cause and the expression of thankfulness. Gratitude for blessings received entails obligation to the service of God and man. It is largely in the service of man that the service of God is realised. It is "in one body" that we are called to the enjoyment of all sacramental blessing, and having fellowship in one Head, communicants are "obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as do conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and the outward man."[1] This communion of the saints is also one existing between the saints on earth and the saints in light. "*All* saints . . . are united to Jesus Christ their Head by His Spirit."[2] What exactly is the relationship existing between the great cloud of witnesses and the earthly runners surrounded by that throng invisible, is but little revealed. Yet surely if in sentiment merely we would fain connect ourselves with the line of illustrious Christian men and women now in glory, a welcome means of doing so is to be found in this sacred ceremony counted so precious by them and handed on by them to us. Of the sainted dead some were known to us as fellow-communicants in

[1] *Westminster Confession*, chap. xxvi. [2] *Ibid.*

the earthly shrine—pastors, teachers, guides, friends, parents, kinsfolk, and it may be one dearer than all beside. Between those loved departed ones and us who remain the bond now strongest is the holy religion of our mutual faith, and in that religion there can be no more hallowed link than that created by the memory of mutual communion in the Sacrament here below. Never more sincerely than on a Communion Sabbath did we say within ourselves, "Come, it is our holy day; let us go up to the House of the Lord together!" Hence it is that at the Lord's Supper thoughts of loved ones above so readily occur to our minds; hence also that the thankful commemoration of the departed, always impressive and often touching, satisfies an instinctive Christian feeling. Anticipation of reunion is quickened, and of that reunion the Sacrament is felt to be a pledge, until the day break and the shadows flee away!

Meanwhile, every Communion is an admonition and a stimulus to more Christian living in every relationship in life. Successive Communions ought to be milestones in progress made with respect to that "whole discipline of piety"[1] in which the conscientious Dr. Johnson was wont to examine himself on occasions of Communion. At a time of Easter, while lamenting that he has "corrected

[1] *Rambler*, 110.

no external habits," he is obliged to add, "I hope that since my last Communion, I have advanced by pious reflections, in my submission to God, and my benevolence to man."[1] In time of Communion, strength against coming temptation is acquired, and many a tempted Christian has been mercifully preserved from transgression by the remembrance of consecration sealed at the Table of the Lord. Thus the eminent Scotsman, Adam Black, whose statue stands in Edinburgh, in speaking of his experience as a young man in London, where he became a communicant, says: "I found this step gave a stability to my character, and proved a defence from follies and vices, especially as a young man in London entirely my own master, with no one to guide or check me."[2] Certainly it is not easy to tempt that man in whose palm the pressure of Christ's hand still lingers.

Amongst the practical benefits to be derived from the Lord's Supper there are some peculiarly valuable for the present day. Amid the rush of modern life, with its multiplicity of interests, duties, and pleasures, the act of meditation and the practice of tranquillity are, it is often said, lost accomplishments. How salutary in this respect is

[1] *Life*, by Boswell.

[2] Quoted by Dr. Cameron Lees in *Life and Conduct*, p. 100.

the alterative supplied by a Communion Service! In the stillness of the sacramental hour, in the holy aloofness from worldly distractions and feverish contacts, in the restfulness of a function calling chiefly for receptiveness and passiveness, in the recollection of memories of past religious experience, in the consciousness of the antiquity and catholicity of a Rite continuous through so many centuries and now encompassing the globe;—in all this there is a reposeful influence of much prophylactic value.

The hard prose of modern life is softened by the poetic quality of the ceremony, and vulgar materialism is chastened by its mystic atmosphere. Materialism, also as an intellectual temper, tends to be mitigated. That our clumsy distinctions between matter and spirit may ultimately give place to a recognition of some higher unity, has been hinted by Sir Oliver Lodge in one of his recent addresses.[1] Such premonitions find a congenial medium in the Sacrament, where intuition outruns mere ratiocination, and where the soul grows conscious of the truth that the iron frame of this world is after all penetrable by forces of the unseen universe.

Thus far we have supposed a tolerable amount of agreement as to the things most surely believed

[1] At Glasgow, Nov. 1904.

among us, but in a time of intellectual doubt the question of the minimum of doctrinal belief requisite for communicating is one of great concern to multitudes of thoughtful men and women, who, although sincere disciples of Jesus, yet refrain from the Sacrament, because of a sensitive aversion to any appearance of subscribing to dogmas which they either disbelieve or are holding in suspense. Thus Professor D. H. Bassermann, who occupies a theological chair in one of the German universities, has recently written an interesting series of Letters to a Layman, the layman being one who holds aloof from the Holy Meal because of the slenderness of his equipment in point of positive dogma. In these letters the writer endeavours to lead his friend from the position of a merely ethical sympathy with Christianity into a more positive belief in the living Person behind the ethical system, and from this into a sense of the duty and benefit of engaging in the Memorial of the Divine Master.[1]

Recent articles in the *Hibbert Journal*, by Sir Oliver Lodge and other thinkers, on the attitude of laymen to church worship, and books like *The Diary of a Church-goer*, recently published, afford fresh indications that there are many minds maintaining

[1] *Über Reform des Abendmahls:* Briefe an einen Laien. Tübingen, 1904.

religious fellowship with Jesus, yet unable to assent to the metaphysical theories of His Person contained in creeds like the Nicene. It is long since Albrecht Ritschl of Tübingen urged the possibility of a real experience of justification and reconciliation through Christ, while at the same time professing to discard metaphysics and to decline anything like bondage to historical detail in the Gospels. A writer, in these respects largely Ritschlian, who has just completed an erudite work on the Lord's Supper (awaiting deserved translation) is Herr K. G. Goetz of Basle. Although we do not assent to his extreme critical views, nor to his opinion, reached on very slender grounds, that Christ Himself may not have been the originator of the Lord's Supper as we find it in the later New Testament, yet his conclusion is of interest for those who share his general standpoint. In spite of historical uncertainty, he concludes, there is nevertheless ample subjective justification for the various views of the Supper that commend themselves to different types of minds, the ritualistic, mystic, and intellectual. In any case, he who, following the steps of Jesus, strives by faith to understand the original Supper, will succeed in some true sense; for the Rite is eloquent of the greatness of Jesus.[1]

[1] *Die Abendmahlsfrage in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, von Karl Gerold Goetz, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 310, 311.

This modern sense of the greatness of Jesus as it breaks through the Gospels as they are read in the presence of Christian worshippers, has been well expressed in *The Diary of a Church-goer*. The author, who styles himself unorthodox, in writing of the gospel narrative, pens the following words, which he probably would not grudge to see applied to the story of the Institution of the Supper: "As the verses follow one another, suddenly out of the well-known story there comes a strange thrilling sense of heights and depths never before scaled or plumbed. Something in the air, something in ourselves, something it may be in the voice of the reader, in sunny mornings, in country churches, when scents and sounds of summer come thro' the open windows, in the equable atmosphere of some vast minster, when the words spoken at the lectern are encompassed with stillness — under all varying circumstances, defying calculation and explanation,—the new comes out of the old, the passion out of the commonplace, and we say within ourselves, 'This thing is of God.'"[1] There are not a few who, like the late T. H. Green[2] of Oxford, feel the power of Christ as a Divine idea, without assenting literally to customary formularies. Such minds, as well as others of a tentative and eclectic disposition, apt

[1] Page 213. [2] *Sermons on Faith* and *The Witness of the Spirit*.

to hold ideas in suspense, and with too great an addiction to the abstract, might derive benefit from the embodiment of Christian ideas in the concrete form of the Supper.

Thus, as the lives of very diverse communicants proceed year by year, amidst all dimness of vision, feebleness of faith, and slowness in spiritual growth, the good work of grace is being carried forward to an ultimate perfection. Meanwhile, "the rest from individual effort, the calm after long striving, the secret joy in God, the acquiescing in His will, in which the true elevation of devotion lies —of these all men are not capable; but all may reach the silent and humble adoration of God which arises out of a pure and quiet mind."[1] Nor is there any means of grace by which such purity and quietude of mind can be more truly begotten than by the silent and humble adoration of our Lord Jesus Christ in the hour of believing Communion. While the mystical union of the soul with Christ is far from being confined to the Holy Supper, the quickening of faith and love experienced during those moments of sacramental interchange is marvellous indeed. The testimony of Boston is not exceptional. We give it as quoted by Dr. Sprott, who urges the value of obeying the West-

[1] J. H. Shorthouse in *John Inglesant*.

minster Directory in its injunction that the Minister make the Declaration "that these elements, otherwise common, are now set apart and sanctified to this holy use by the word of institution and prayer;" (even as in Baxter's Liturgy the elements are to be declared "sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ"). "The elements after consecration, being declared to be no more common bread and wine, but sacred symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, I felt in my spirit a sensible change accordingly. I discerned the sacramental union of the signs and the thing signified, and was thereby let into a view of the mystical union. I saw it, I believed it, and I do believe it this day. I do not remember myself ever to have been so distinct in the view and faith of this glorious mystery. . . . This is the second time I have most remarkably felt that change on my spirit upon the declaring as above said. May I never omit to declare as said in the administration of that ordinance."[1]

In concluding our present survey of the wide field of thought connected with the Lord's Supper, in its history theory and practice during the past nineteen centuries, we may venture to express the devout hope that this great Sacrament of the world's

[1] *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland.* G. W. Sprott, D.D., p. 123.

Redemption, purged of all false accretions and enriched by the experience and reflection of manifold generations, will again become what it was at the first, the symbol and the means of real unity throughout all Christendom.

INDEX

Aaron's pot, 3.
Abel's offerings, 3.
Abraham's sacrifices, 3.
Acts of Apostles, 4.
Addis, W. E., 260.
Agapé, 15, 23, 31, 34.
Age for first Communion, 259.
Altar, 24, 25.
Ambrose, 13.
Amen, 32.
Andrewes, Lancelot, 235.
Antidote of immortality, 35.
Apocalypse, 26.
Apologeticus, 34.
Apologia, Newman's, 116.
Apology, Justin's, 31.
Apostolical Constitutions, 260.
Aquinas, Thomas, 43.
Articles, 66, 67, 71, 74, 75, 76.
Asceticism, 271.
Ascham, Roger, 73.

Babylonian Captivity, 66.
Banquet, Plato's, 140.
Baptism, 11, 257.
Barnabas, 27.
Bassermann, 278.
Baxter's Liturgy, 77, 282.
Beet, Prof., 15.
Black, Adam, 276.
Black Rubric, 74.
Boston, Thomas, 104, 281.
Breaking of bread, 20, 21.
Bruce, Robert, 86, 233.
Bucer, 65, 691.
Bullinger, 65.
Bunyan, 238.
Butler, 103.

Calvin, 61, 208, 264.
Canterbury, Archbishop of, 57.
Carlstadt, 59.
Catechisms, Westminster, 89, 91, 270.
Ceremony, 134.
Chalmers, Thomas, 125.
Charles I., 86.
Child-Communion, 260.
Chrysostom, 50, 228.
Clement of Alexandria, 43, 45.
Clement of Rome, 27, 28.
Coal of fire, 4.
Coe, Prof., 261.
Coleridge, S. T., 109, 246.
Commission, Christ's, 20.
Common Prayer (Edward VI.), 68.
Communion of saints, 274.
Confessio Variata, 65.
Confession, Westminster, 88, 89, 90, 91.
Confraternity of Sacrament, 124.
Consecration of elements, 31, 201, 204, 215, 219.
Corinthians, Epistles to, 21.
Corpus Christi, Feast of, 41.
Convocation, 53, 76.
Covenants, 3.

Cranmer, 67, 69, 72.
Cup of blessing, 22.
Cup of the Lord, 22.
Cup, denial of, 273.
Cyprian, 37.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 13, 48.
Cyril Lucaris, 53.

Date of Passover, 18.
Declaration, the, 282.
De Imitatione, 232.
Demeter, 44.
Denney, Prof., 11, 13, 25.
Devotional literature, 227.
Diary of a Church-goer, 278, 280.
Didaché, 28.
Dionysius, 50.
Directory, Westminster, 80, 89, 91.
Disruption, Scottish, 127.
Doctrinal minimum, 278.
Doctrines in Sacrament, 157, 162.
Dorner, 52, 61, 151.
Douglas, 80.
Drinking Christ's blood, 12.
Drinking into one Spirit, 23.

Eating Christ's flesh, 12.
Ecclesiastical Sonnets, 253.
Edward VI., 67.
Edwards, Jonathan, 104, 245.
Election, 269.
Elizabeth, Queen, 73.
Emmaus, 19.
Ephesians, Epistle to, 23.
Ephrem, St., 4, 254.
Erasmus, 56, 66.
Eucharist, 31, 32.
Eucharistic Adoration, 247.
Euchologion, 128.
Exclusiveness, 271.
Experimental benefits, 67.

Fear of communicating, 267.
Feasts, 6, 9.
Feeding the multitude, 10.
Fermented wine, 272.
First Book of Discipline, 80, 81.
Fourfold State, The, 104.
Free Church of Scotland, 128.
Friends, Society of, 95.
Frith, 66.
Froude, Hurrell, 115.

Gennadios, 51.
Gift in Sacrament, 156.
Gilbert, 14.
Goetz, 279.
Gore, 121, 123, 145.
Greek Church, 42.
Greek customs, 53.
Green, T. H., 280.
Gregory of Nazianzum, 49.
Gregory of Nyssa, 48.

Hales, John, 94.
Halifax, Lord, 124.
Hallowed bread, 3.
Hamilton, Patrick, 79.
Harnack, 27, 36, 42, 50.
Hatch, 43.
Hebrews, Epistle to, 24.
Hegel, 148.
Henry VIII., 66.
Herbert, George, 236, 261.
Hermann, Archbishop, 69.
Hermas, 27.
Heron, 28.
Highlands, Scottish, 266.
Hippolytus, 36.
Hooker, 133.
House of Lords' judgment, 269.
Huss, 55, 56.

Ignatius, 27.
Incarnation, 40.
Individual cup, 272.
Institution of Supper, 13.
Insubstantiation, 53.
Intercession of Christ, 186.
Intercessory prayer, Christ's, 18.
Irenæus, 34.
Irish Episcopal Church, 77.
Irving, Edward, 125, 126.

James VI., 76, 86.
Jerome, 13.
John of Damascus, 13.
John, St., Epistle of, 24.
John, St., Gospel of, 18.
Johnson, Samuel, 104, 246, 275.
Jude, St., Epistle of, 24.
Justin Martyr, 31.

Kant, 109.
Keble, 114, 247.
Kiss, 31.
Knox, John, 80, 84, 86, 261.
Knox, Vicesimus, 12.
Kyd, B. J., 72.

Lake Poets, 112.
Lateran Council, 40.
Laud, 53.
Lights, 35.
Liturgies of the Sacrament, 193.
Liturgy, Baxter's, 77, 282.
—— Bersier's, 224.
—— Calvin's, 208.
—— Catholic Apostolic, 224.
—— Church of England, 213.
—— Church of Scotland, 221.
—— Congregational, 225.
—— *Didaché*, 200.
—— Eastern, 200.
—— Edward VI., 67.
—— Free Church of Scotland, 222.
—— French Reformed, 212.
—— German Evangelical, 208.
—— Greek, 200.
—— Knox's, 217.
—— Luther's, 206.
—— New Testament, 193.
—— Petrine, 16.
—— Scottish Bishops', 86.
—— Scottish Episcopal, 224.
—— St. Giles', 224.
—— Theistic, 137.
Loaves of setting forth, 3.
Lodge, Sir O., 277, 278.
Lollards, 79.
Lombard, Peter, 41.
Lord's Prayer, 12.
Love-Feast, Wesleyan, 103.
Low Mass, 41.
Luke, St., 17.
Luther, 56, 57, 66, 233.
Lytle Treatise, Frith's, 66.

M'Cheyne, A. Murray, 127.
Macdonald, George, 269.
Malachi's pure offering, 7.
Manna, 4.
Manning, H. E., 249.
Martineau, James, 143, 251.
Martyr, Peter, 69.
Mary, Queen of England, 73.
Mary, Queen of Scots, 86.
Mass, 16, 177.
Melanchthon, 63, 65.
Melchizedek's gifts, 3.
Melville, Andrew, 86.
Messianic reign, 6.
Middle Ages, 39.
Millenary petition, 76.
Milligan, Dr., 185.
Mixed Chalice, 33.
Moberly, Prof., 183.
Moody, D. L., 128.
Mysteries, Eleusinian, 44.

Newman, J. H., 115, 118, 119, 248.
New Testament, 8.
Nicene Council, 51.
Nineteenth century, 9.
Noah's covenant, 3.

Obstacles to Communion, 263.
Occam, 60.
Ochino, 69.
Old Testament, 1.
Olney school, 114.
Order, Book of Common, 82, 84.
Origen, 36.
Owen, John, 98, 103.
Oxford Movement, 141.

Paley, 103.
Papias, 27.
Parables, 10.
Parker, Archbishop, 74.
Paschasius, 39, 157.
Passover, 5.
Pilgrim's Progress, The, 238.
Pius IV., 73.
Plummer, 16.
Polycarp, 27.
Practical Aspects, 257.
Presbyterians, English, 93.
Presence bread, 31.
Present-day needs, 276.
Priesthood, Christian, 187.
Pusey, 118, 120.

Quakers, 136.
Quietists, 60.

Real Presence, 96, 120, 163, 177.
Receiving Christ, 154.
Remembrance, 17.
Reservation, 33.
Res Sacramenti, 149.
Resurrection, After Christ's, 19.
Revivalism, 269.
Ritschl, 279.
Roman Catholic recent thought, 129.
Row, 79.
Ruskin, 114.

Sacrifice, 1, 2, 9, 34, 37, 38, 48.
Sacrificial Idea, 37.
Sadler, M. F., 121.
Sancta Sanctis, 31.
Sanday, 11.
Savonarola, 55, 56.
Savoy Conference, 76.
Schoolmen, 41.
Schwenfeld, 59.
Scott, Sir W., 113.
Seabury, Bishop, 77.
Second Book of Discipline, 86.
Short Catechysme, A, 70.
Smith, Dr. Walter C., 253.
Socrates, 140.
Song of Songs, 7.
Sophocles, 44.
Spiritual meat and drink, 22.
Spottiswoode, 79.
Sprott, G. W., 282.
Spurgeon, C. H., 150, 250.
Stanley, Dean, 52.
Supersubstantial bread, 13.
Synod of Jerusalem, 53.
Synod of London, 73.

Tabernacle table, 3.
Table talk, Christ's, 18.
Taylor, Jeremy, 96, 242.
Temple, The, 237.
Tertullian, 34.
Thomas Aquinas, 43.
Threshold Covenant, The, 5.
Tillotson, 94.
Tintern Abbey, 112.
Transubstantiation, 38, 40, 129.

Unitarian address, 142.
Unitarian Liturgy, 226.
United Presbyterian Church, 128.
Unworthy communicating, 265.

Verbum Visibile, 8.
Voysey, Charles, 137.

Waldenses, 55.
Wesley, John, 103.
Westminster Assembly, 88.
Weston, 72.
Whichcote, 93.
Wilberforce, 63, 120.
William III.'s commission, 77.
Wisdom's invitation, 6.
Wishart, George, 79.
Witness of Sacrament, 25.
Wolf's Articles, 74.

Zwingli, 146.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*

Date Due			
1/19/45			
8-27			
3-14			
10/24/55			
4-10-59			
5-10-59			
5/2/60			
1-3-61			
MAY 16 1970			
DEC 8 1971			

28138

BV
825
A221 28138

AUTHOR

Adamson, R.M.

TITLE Christian doctrine of Lord's supper.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
2/16/57	L Goldberg No Bapt Sem	✓
3-10-59	L. McMeller	✓
4-10-59	RENEW pm ~~(6 due later~~	
4-7-60	Wm Nelsen	
4/29/60	F. Lindo	
2-19-60	Hugh V[illegible]	
1/3/60	Ren[illegible]	
4/25	[illegible]	
MAY 9 '62		
MAY 2 [illegible]		